ks

1. Bolander, Henry N., Fifth Biennial Report of the Supt. of Public Instruction, 1872-1873, Sacramento: State Printer, 1873

Subjects: compulsory education, school finance, teacher training

Notes: The format for report changes from those of earlier supts. to one that contains less narrative and is more heavily statistical [see for example, Fitzgerald, below]. Bolander starts with reports on several topics written mostly by others. These include reports on compulsory ed. (11-22); relation between crime and ed. (23-33); relation between ed. and pauperism (33-39); school finance (40-62) and need for trained teachers (63-136 which is composed mostly of exam questions and answers).

2. California Congress of Mothers, History of the California Congress of Mothers and Parent-Teacher Associations, Los Angeles: n.p., n.d.

Subjects: parent involvement, Congress of Mothers, Parent Teacher Assn., Child Study Circle,

Notes: Mothers organizations were formed during the late 19th century to "bring home and school in closer touch" (5); they began in Los Angeles with the Kindergarten Dept.; by 1900, there were so many branches that a federation of clubs was established; Miss Mary F. Ledyard, Spt. of the Kindergarten Dept. organized a mass meeting of the National Congress of Mothers on May 8, 1900 in LA [goes on to give a chronology of the org. through 1908]

(15) Purpose of the new organization- to "bind parents and teachers together in a common interest for childhood"; photo of 7 officers (facing p. 16). At least two standing committees were established: the Child Study Circle and the Parent-Teacher Assn. (18)

[Bancroft Library, pF860/E3N25]

3. Carr, William G., John Swett: The Biography of an Educational Pioneer, Santa Ana: Fine Arts Press, 1933

Subjects: Swett, early schools

Notes: [Chapters 1-3 mostly pre-Calif. life; 4 on early years in Calif. and getting job at Rincon School; much is the conventional stuff that Polos and others cover when writing about Swett]

(56) The early schools used a system called "self-reporting" - at the end of the school day, the roll would be called, and each student would respond by admitting their transgressions of that day: "whispered, spoken to, or perfect." Swett didn't like this system because he thought it encouraged the (57) children to "make erroneous reports in their own interest." [Swett, at a Teachers Institute meeting in Sacto, 1867--so apparently the system was still used]. (58) He also opposed using student monitors and getting children to "tattle" on one another; (60) and objected to corporal punishment; he believed in the application of "judicious severity" and won great admiration and respect from his students; (61) in 1857, Swett planned

a brief trip back to the East; his students found out and organized a May Day festival in his honor at Russ Gardens, raising $390 for Swett for his expenses. [Does this mean that the students decided what to do with the money? see Rincon Scrapbook and write Girt Farm]

Swett was a well-known promoter of physical education; at the 1861 Teachers Institute, boys from the Rincon School performed "double and single dumbbell exercises, free gymnastics, calisthenics, wands, and Indian club exercises."

(78) Swett, as state supt. of public instruction, sought to eliminate the annual examination of teachers, and in the 1862 school law, a state examination board was created in part to take over this chore; Swett argued that the current system was so bad, "as it would be for a green-grocer to examine John Stuart Mill in political economy."

(79) Much of his time in 1862-3 was spent on revisions of the school law; in Apr. 1863, all new forms had to be created for the Department of Public Instruction [is this what it was called? any info at CSA? nothing in DoE about it] (79-82, details of the Teachers Institute) Among its achievements was initiating a state educational journal, the California Teacher, a monthly, 24 page journal; appointed editors were Swett, George Minns (SF High School), George Tait (SF supt of schools); SIC Swezey and John Pelton (both of SF schools) were voted in as resident editors; and each county appointed a contributing editor; (83) Swett also proposed formation of a state teachers society (84) [the text of the preamble and first 3 sections of the constitution are reproduced, but these do not indicate, as did other sources, that membership was exclusively male] [ff. to 97, details on Swett's travels and activities as state supt.]

Carr speculates that no official minutes of the State Board of Education were kept until 1866 [that's earliest date for CSA's board minutes; how did the structure of the board change? Where did I read that? Were replacements made in Board 1867-72?], since none had yet been found; but it was reorganized in Apr. 1866, and became a more systematic body; (99) to date the proceedings of the 5th Teachers Institute have not been found, and he suggests maybe they weren't published.

(100) when Swett ran for reelection in 1867, the SF male teachers and preachers printed a flyer in his support; (101) the female teachers of Oakland also supported him with a resolution that concluded: "We DO NOT FAVOR the 'right of suffrage' to women, but we do profess to be educators, and always interested in the improvement of the masses and believe we can do no greater good than by now putting forth this our humble effort to secure to the people of Calif. the election of Hon. J. Swett." During the bitter campaign against democrat OP Fitzgerald, Swett was charged with misappropriation of school funds, recommending and certifying teachers based on party lines, accepting bribes from publishers, and permitting two blacks to attend Rincon school in 1858; Swett lost, as did all other republicans in a democratic landslide vote.

(102) Swett believed "Our American system of free schools is based upon two fundamental principles or axioms: First, that it is the duty of a Republican or Representative Government, as an act of self-preservation, to provide for the education of every child; Second, that the property of the State should be taxed to pay for that education." These ideas underpinned his action on behalf of developing a public education system, and he developed the

relationships between the ideals and achieving them in his annual reports. That govt. needed to provide schools implied that buildings would be built, maintained, and staffed, and that quality would be ensured [?] He had no patience with squalid school buildings, "The stables of the wealthy ranchmen in the vicinity are elegant edifices in comparison... No intelligent farmer would think of using them to house his prize pigs!"

(103) Swett visited a one room school house near Santa Clara that was no more than a "miserable hut" where teacher and students "were crowded almost of suffocation," yet they "carried on." Swett told them: "You and your teacher are too good for this miserable shanty. Some of you have no desks and some of you are sitting on the platform. I want you to pack up your books, carry them home, say to your parents that the State Supt. of Public Instruction, Mr. Swett, visited you today and directed you to tell them that you have struck work. You are not going to school any more until you are provided with a better schoolhouse." The trustees got moving, and rented a new schoolroom right away; within a year they built a new school.

(104) Swett was adamant on the issue of adequate school buildings: he railed against "these redwood libels on public schools; these uncouth squatters by the disty roadsides; these tattered beggars imploring charitable donations; these unpainted, unfurnished, unfenced, unfinished, almost uninhabitable hovels." and He ordered trustees, "Schoolhouses must be built and you are the agents whose duty it is to build them...If your schoolhouse is meaner than half the barns in the district, you will call a district meeting, levy a tax, and build a new one." (105) During 2 years of his term, spending for building schoolhouses rose five times. He didn't demand state control, but felt it the duty of the state to dessiminate information on and enforce certain standards of safey, sanitation, etc.

(goes into involvement with state normal school, certification, and teacher standards; he said any teacher not buying the California Journal should lose their teaching cert.; (107 ff.) more details on state textbooks and state supervision; and obligatino of people to pay taxes; follow up.)

(116) Not only did the democrats take over the state offices in the 1867 election, they also dominated the SF school board; but the appointed Swett to prin. of the Denman grammar school, according to Carr, "the latest word in school architecture" with 3 bookcases, a swinging (117) blackboard, and a clock in every room; a 400 vol. library; Carr quotes the architect: "finished with cement, painted and sanded to a light color which gives it an air of cheerfulness" 4 stories tall; "a mansard roof with a cupola and a high balustrade"; top story an 12' tall attic with 22 projecting windows; assembly room large enough to hold the whole student body; playground inside "a brick wall and a neat fence"; cost $85,000; at 5th and Market. about 800 girls.

Prins. job changed to allow time for visiting other classes and schools; [details on additional ed'l activities, deputy supt. of public schools- first one to serve in the new office, under JH Widber; in the new position, he visited schools, made exams, graded papers, wrote reports, made "minor administrative adjustments" and sat on platforms.

(121) June, 1876, Swett took over as prin. of Girls High School- [details] stayed for 13 years; [ff. details on written work] (125, 1867 campaign against Fitzgerald was bitter on both sides)

(131 ff.) Swett's family and friends including Henry George and John Muir, Kate D. Wiggin, Sarah B. Cooper; (141 ff.) National Education Assn.

(144 ff.) By 1889 [?] 864 students graduated from Girls High and Normal school under Swett; the 11 women graduating in 1884 taught all together about 300 years! Carr estimates about half a million students were taught by students who studiedt under Swett!

(147 ff.) Carr says Swett had an aversion to the political spoils system through which teachers and other school employees were appointed, (148) and he said so; party hacks didn't like Swett, and decided to get rid of him; SF's whole govt. was degraded between 1880 and 1900 [ff. details on the problems this meant] and the conflict ended in Swett's resignation, to the dismay of many, including former students; (158) Swett took on the system, running for SF supt. of schools, and was elected in 1990, taking office Jan. 1, 1990; [details on that term; he didn't run for a second term; 163-64, list of 20 of Swett's achievements in that office] (167) in 1893, he largely retired to Hill Girt Farm.

4. Cloud, Archibald J., Lowell High School: San Francisco 1856-1956 Palo Alto: Pacific Books, 1956

Subjects: school histories

Notes: (13) 1856-1858-The school was named the Union Grammar School; 1858-64-San Francisco High School; 1864-94-Boys High School; from 1894-on Lowell High School. In 1852, when the question of a SF high school was first raised, Cloud says by Nevins, there were only about 20 high schools in the U.S., the earliest founded in Boston in about 1832; SF claimed to be too poor at that time, and the idea was postponed till '56, (14) in part because of the financial turmoil of the mid-50s. (15) However, in Aug, '56, Union Grammar was established as a co-educational school offering advanced courses of study. The school first met in rented rooms in Dr. Boring's Wesleyan Methodist Church on Powell St., between Clay and Sacramento with 35 boys and 45 girls. Its staff consisted of Prin. Ellis H. Holmes and two teachers who conducted courses in mathmatics, natural sciences, common English, moral and intellectual philosophy."

In January 1858, the school was renamed the SF High School, additional classes were added, and it was acknowledged as a permanent institution. (16) Dec. 14, 1859, the first graduation took place, with 4 girls and 7 boys who had completed 3 years of h.s. and written an "exhaustive final" exam; State supt. A.J. Moulder spoke at the graduation exercises. In 1860, the school board bought the church building and remodeled it at a cost of $27,000; its formal dedication took place on Sept. 19 that year; 133 students attended the ceremony where Rev. Thomas Starr King spoke.

In 1864, sex segregation was instituted (17) and Prin. Holmes and the girls were sent out to other quarters; the h.s. became Boys High School, with Prin. George W. Minns, who had served as natural sciences teacher since the Union Grammar opened its doors; between 1865-68, the classical dept. broke off and formed Latin High School, taking several boys along; for a while, Boys High became "Boys English High School; however, in '68, Latin School was abolished, and students transferred

back to Boys High.

In 1866, Boys High had 78 students, 3 teachers and Prin. Theodore Bradley, known as "'very scholarly but a severe disciplinarian.'" (18) By 1875, there were 250 students and 8 teachers, that year W.T. Reid became prin. and the boys moved into a newly constructed building on Sutter between Gough and Octavia. (19) Additions were built in 1889 and in 1893; John F. Swett, Supt. John Swett's son who graduated there in 1897 wrote of the building that it "reflected the spirit of the times in regard to school architecture, was painfully plain...Grim and forbidding, it reared its gloomy, barn-like silhouette amid an otherwise rather attractive group of homes....The school yard [was] a drab place, all floored over with rough boards, with sheds on the rear for protection from the rain. No flowers were ever seen in this gloomy building."

(20) School discipline changed when Frank Morton became prin. in 1888, from "semi-military rule" to "a student body growing into co-operative activity." (22) The same year, girls were again admitted, and that year the student body was composed of 338 boys and 40 girls; Morton said in his 1889 report: "The wisdom of the step has been fully proved. The girls have taken hold of the work with a zeal born from a desire to excel. They have shown themselves able to meet all the requirements of a vigorous course of study...and the scholarship and moral character of the school have been elevated by their presence."

In 1894, Boys High officially became Lowell High, after James Russell Lowell, Amercian poet, editor and educator. (24) Over time, administration grew in the school, from 2 teachers and a prin. in 1856 to 9 teachers and a prin, in 1881; in 1892 11 teachers, a prin and a vice prin.; in 1908 13 teachers; in 1916, 37 teachers; in 1932-85 teachers who conducted classes for 2222 students.

(25) The school moved to a new building in 1913, in the block bounded by Masonic Ave., Hayes, Ashbury and Grove streets. (26) more additions were made; and in 1938 a gym added.

(36) Mary M. Cox was the first woman to teach at Boys High 1888-1924.

5. Cuban, Larry, How Teachers Taught: Constancy and Change in American Classrooms, 1890-1980, New York: Longman, 1984

Subjects: history of teaching

Notes: (vii, Foreward by Lee S. Shulman) "Those who conduct research on teaching rarely consider historical investigatins germane to their work. There is a sense in which history is treated as arcane, esoteric, and of little import to the concerns of practice and policy. In reading this book, I am convinced that precisely the opposite is true. Carefully conducted historical inquiry may well provide us with the most powerful guides available." But all ed. studies make two assumptions: that the settings under investigation are representative and that those settings we are interested in are sufficiently like those we study for useful insights to emerge.

(2) Cuban's hurricane metaphor for curriculum change and continuity since 1870 addresses the differences between curriculum theory, courses of study, materials, and classroom instruction:

"Hurrican winds sweep across the sea tossing up 20-foot waves; a fathom below the survace turbulent waters swirl while on the ocean floor there is unruffled calm." The hurricane representing any new curr. theory, which often causes a flurry of activity: articles and books written, debate in the professional literature, careers and reputations made, teaching by professors to college students; but textbooks changed little if any by the new theories, and "most teachers use methods unmarked by controversy, slogans, journal articles, or convention programs." His interest in the stability of teaching practices led him to study taching in a historical context, betofre, during and after 20th century reforms.

(3) He begins by sketching the two poles of a continuum, from teacher-centered instruction [t-ci] to student-centered instruction [s-ci]. At the extreme of t-ci, 1) teachers talk more than students during class; 2) most instruction with whole class; 3) teacher determines how class time is used; 4) desks arranged in rows facing blackboard.

s-ci has different elements: 1) students talk as much as, or more than teacher; 2) most instruction with individuals or small groups; 3) students participate in selecting content of instruction; 4) rules of conduct and penalties for misbehavior are at least partially chosen by students; 5) instructional materials vary so that some can be used alone, some in small groups (interest centers, teaching stations, activity centers); 6) at least half of classroom time is spent using such materials; 7) desks and tables are arranged and rearranged according to changing activities; no single pattern dominates.

These constructs of t-ci and s-ci are tools to guide his research, used primarily because no others have yet been developed, particularly no other observable measures of changes in teaching. S-ci practices are roughly synonymous with progressive approaches to teaching, the open classroom. (5) He operationalizes these constructs through 5 indicators of classroom patterns: 1) arrangement of classroom space; 2) ratio of student to teacher talk: 3) context in which most instruction occurs: individually, small group, whole class; 4) presence of learning centers that are regularly used; 5) amount of student movement around the classroom without asking teacher's permission. His central research question involves the stability of "certain teaching behaviors ... decade after decade in the face of mighty efforts to move toward student-centered instruction." He isn't trying to evaluate which methods are better or more effective, he wants to fill in the gap that exists in our knowledge about what happens inside classrooms.

Usefulness of the research: 1) because some classroom practices have persisted for nearly a century in the face of efforts to change them, he can shed some light on the "potential and the limits to classroom change," so we can find out what is "transcient, what is open to improvement and what is invulnerable to reform." With this knowledge, "citizens and professionals can come to have reasonable expectations about what teachers can and cannot do, what schools can be held accountable for and what is beyond their reach. Such modest outcomes offer practical directions for the periodic surges of reform that sweep over public schools." (6) He suggests there ought to be a page in the Guiness Book of World Records for failed classroom reforms. Maybe by studying how they have taught will present some clues for both teachers and reformers about paths that might be more effectively followed; finding out what has remained stable among

teaching practices can help guide professors whose job it is to turn out future generations of teachers; by knowing practices that have persisted, administrators can work more effectively with experienced teachers; in more practical terms, it can help give current teachers a sense of professional identity to know how their earlier colleagues adapted to working conditions in the classroom; finally, most reforms of the past century originated outside the classroom, and were beyond the control of individual teachers; "Were teachers to be more informed about the history of classroom instruction perhaps they would voice their preferences based upon a firm knowledge of what can and cannot be done in classrooms are they are presently organized."

(7) He urges changing the metaphor for schools from the factory to the farm: The factory image is based on the machine, reinforced by rational decision making, so every element of schooling can become part of a planned change; with the farm, "you start you start with an ancient, stable process and build your effort around the sun, climate, seeds, plants, and what insects are likely to do. By understanding the durability and limits to the process,... you can improve production. But you cannot ... ignore those 'older organic forces you have little control over.' You have to work through them."

Two research questions: 1) Did teacher-centered instruction persevere in public schools during and after reform movements that had as one of their targets installing student-centered instruction? 2) If ... yes, to what extent did it persist and why? If... no, to what extent did instruction change and why?

His data: he's reconstructed "historical maps" of classroom practices in 3 cities and several rural districts during the 1920s and 1930s; in 2 cities and one state for 1965-75; for one middle-size school district in a metro. area 1975-81. These period cover the main reform movements: the progressive era and the briefer period of open classroom and informal learning. Data sources: 1) photographs of classrooms with students and teachers; 2) tests and textbooks; 3) student recollections; 4) teacher reports of how they taught; 5) reports from classroom observers (parents, reporters, administrators); 6) student writings in school newspapers and yearbooks; 7) descriptions of classroom layout (size, desk styles and configuration, building plans and other sources).

(8) He's juxtaposed his materials from multiple sources to guard against bias (posed photos) and selectivity (what survives compared to what is typcial); from the materials he's garnered descriptions of classrooms 1890-1980; he's interpreted these "embedded within a larger set of data from each district": studies of teachers; national data on teaching practices.

Explanations for persistence of practices in classrooms: 1) "Schools are a form of social control and sorting." 2) "The organizational structur of the school and classroom drove teachers into adopting instructional practices that changed little over time." 3) "The culture of teaching itself tilts toward stability and a reluctance to change." (10) Explanations for change: 4) "Ideas about how children develop, the role of the school, classroom authority, and the place of subject matter in instruction determine teaching practices." (11) 5) "What determines instructional practice is whether or not reforms were effectively implemented in classrooms."

(12, n. 4) On the failure of ed. researchers to use historical materials: the Coleman report, one of the most influential studies of the 1960s, was "Far removed from classrooms, ... [yet] had profoudn

consequences for both the public view of schooling, practitioner's aspirations for their students, and initially channeling research away from classrooms." Coleman depended primariliy on facilities available to students and standardized test scores.

TEACHING c. 1900 (18) most student were in rural schools, over 77% in locales of under 4000 people. Urban schools were graded, in session 9 months per year; most teachers had formal ed. beyond h.s., 65% of primary and grammar school teachers were female; desks came in rows bolted together, and were positioned facing teacher's desk and blackboard; courses of study established what was to be taught and when; report cards and homework were commonplace. But in rural schools, less than half, on average, was spent per pupil, so schools got "less of everything." Older buildings, too few books and supplies, inadequate equipment; ungraded classrooms, teachers had little formal ed., school year was shorter.

(19) In both rural and urban schools, the dominant classroom style was teacher centered; heavily dependent on text book materials; heavy on memorization and group recitation; little change between 1820 and 1880, according to Finkelstein. Kaestle found, though, that corporal punishment declined during that period, that there was more ability grouping, more textbook uniformity and more graded classes; (25) no one has studied classrooms in high schools yet, but indications are that there were similarities with lower levels: (30) classes taught en masse, teacher talked most, students moved only with teacher permission, lots of recitation, bolted down desks; differences: 1) subject matter stressed to greater degree in h.s. 2) students went from one classroom to another and had different teachers in classes each of about an hour in h.s. 3) h.s. classes generally smaller; 4: h.s. teachers generally better educated.

(31) Assumptions underlying t-ci c. 1900: bureaucratic efficiency, the importance of organizational uniformity and standardization, growing interest in anything viewed as scientific. Educators, for the most part, believed learning was best enacted through memorization and recitation.

STUDENT-CENTERED INSTRUCTION c. 1900 - two forms: 1) practical, common sense based in one room schools, partly imposed by conditions of scarcity of resources, isolation, need for cooperation, tolerance of students moving around; 2) innovations developed mostly in private schools, more theoretical; a diverse number of experiments following Froebel [the kindergarten ideas] or Pestalozzi's "object teaching," developments at the Oswego State Normal and Training School; others were Francis Wayland Parker, whom Dewey characterized as the "Father of Progressivism" and John Dewey and the Laboratory School at Univ. of Chicago. (36) The public schools of Gary, Ind., one public school in Chicago, and two Indianapolis schools (one white and one black) were among the few public schools to follow pregressive innovations before 1900. After 1900, greater efforts were made to adopt s-ci into the public school systems.

1920-1940 (44) classrooms in NYC, Denver and Washington D.C.

6. Fitzgerald, O.P. , Third Biennial Report of the Supt. of Public Instruction, 1868-1869, D.W. Gelwicks, State Printer, 1869

Subjects: purpose of education, teacher pay, colored schools, sex

segregation

Notes: (6) Fitzgerald complains about the "sordid materialism" of education in the effort to make it "practical" the problem of expressing everything in terms of monetary value; there's more to ed. than training to make money, "Undue importance is attached to wealth; its pomps and vanities; too little to culture, character, home duties and pleasures." (7) Ed. is no longer to consist in rules of grammar, facility in numbers or elegant penmanship, in historical names and dates, or the boundaries of nations. It must embrace, to be complete, a competent knowledge of the world we inhabit, the world fo mind, and what is vaster and more vital than either, the moral universe. The faculties are to be developed, logical methods of thought induced, principles, habits and sentiments formed and fixed, which will ennoble the character and insure a future useful, virtuous and happy. It does not end when the pupil leaves behind him the threshold of the schools. Youth, duly improved, is but the vestibule to an intellectual maturity; preparation for its duties and engagements." (he quotes from Hon. J.D. Philbrick).

On school boards (he calls them school trustees) a nation as a whole can survive misgovernment and poor laws, but "a corrupt or incompetent local administration is fatal to all prosterity and happiness. The best possible general (8) system will inevitably fail in communities where there is a defective local administration." It's hard to get good people to take on this responsibility, however. Businessmen don't want to work in the public interest without pay and officials are more interested in profits than in honor. So, of those that get elected, "Some are incompetent, others are indifferent. The result is inefficiency, failure. Such a state of facts is discreditable to patriotism and public spirit of our people....Only the best men are suited to fill the office of School Trustee or Director. Let us hope that the time may soon come when only such will be chosen, and that they may feel that the place is one of distinguished honor, and therefore to be desired."....Good citizens sometimes blush at the sight of the dilapidated and unsightly school house, which is a deformith and a disgrace to their town or neighborhood, and perhaps would blush with a deeper shame if they should remember that the disgrace is owing to their own criminal indifference and negligence in the matter of choosing school officers. Needed reform, then, must begin at the fountain head--the people themselves. The stream cannot rise higher than its source. An indifferent and sluggish people will be represented inevitably (and appropriately) by men after their own kind."

Teachers pay (13) he complains about the disparity between pay for men and women "It may be said that the laws of supply and demand must regulate this matter; but it will be difficult to satisfy any candid mind that there can be any justice in scuh a discrimination." While he doesn't support any feminist movement, he wants to go "on the record" as supporting "the same pay for the same work, when done by women as when done by men."

Coeducation of the sexes-(32) more successful in the higher grades to separate the "rough boys" who are "unfit associates for ladylike girls" though the girls do seem to have a "decidedly beneficial effect upon boys." However, the benefits are not clear at the primary level, most teachers prefer mixed primary classes and often its simply impractical to impose sex segregation on them.

(159) Amendment to the school law (172) Sec. 53 "Every school, unless otherwise provided by special law, whall be open for the admission of all white children, between 5 and 21..." Sec. 56 "The education of children of African descent, and Indian children, shall be provided for in separate schools. Upon the written application of the parents or guardians of at least ten such children...a separate school shall be established for the education of such children." Sec 57 requires the same rules apply to colored schools as made for white schools.

7. Gross, Beatrice and Ronald, eds., The Great School Debate: Which Way for Education?, New York: Touchstone , 1985

Subjects: school boards, school reform

Notes: [an edited collection of articles and reports on issues in the current debate on educational crisis and proposed reforms, esp. as generated by A Nation at Risk]

ON SCHOOL BOARDS - [from A Nation at Risk, National Comm. on Excellence in Ed.] (44) Recommendation about leadership and finance: "We recommend that citizens across the Nation hold educators and elected officials responsible for providing the leadership necessary to achieve these reforms, and that citizens provide the fiscal support and stability required to bring about the reforms we propose."

1) Prins. and supts. need to provide greater leadership in schools and in the community to carry out school reform, they need to be good managers and also need the ability to stimulate consensus within the community to stand behind school reforms proposed; school boards have to make sure the prins. and supts. have their support; "school boards must consciously develop leadership skills at the school and district levels if the reforms we propose are to be achieved."

2) School boards, along with state and local officials have "primary responsibility" in the areas of school finance and governance; reforms must be instituted through educational and budget policies.

3) Local, state and federal govs. need to work together on meeting the needs of identifiable groups of students with special needs.

4) The functions of the federal gov. should be focused on issues of broad national significance (for example, ensuring the civil rights of students and teachers are protected, data collection, student financial assistance, etc.) This federal help should not carry with it a baggage of burdonsome and intrusive requirements and red tape.

5) It's the federal gov's responsibility to define the "national interest in education" and provide the leadership necessary to see that this interest is served.

6) [45] "This Commission calls upon educators, parents, and public officials at all levels to assist in bringing about the educational reform proposed int his report. We also call upon citizens to provide the financial support necessary to accomplish these puposes. Excellence costs. But in the long run mediocrity costs far more.

[from Assassins of Excellence, Graham Down] (273) All the reports generated since the Nation at Risk report "with their numbing similarity" to other educational reports that have been written over the past 30 years may actually impede improvement in schools; "All of this activity may be enough to give excellence a bad name." (274) Why should the "legislated excellence" of the 1980s prove more successful than that legislated during the 1970s? "In the name of promoting equality, we Americans have shown a knack for creating and re-creating schemes that disequalize even as they claim to do otherwise." Great disparities exist not just between urban and suburban schools, but even within single school districts between the best and the worst schools, great gulf between the best and the worst teachers and programs within a single school.

(275) There are 3 "killer[s] of excellence" in education: 1) on-going dispartities between the haves and the have-nots that forestalls both equality and excellence; 2) "rampant misuse" of minimum competency testing; 3) "misguided utilitarianism"; he cites an unnamed but "eminent" German historian, "tarnished ideals have an amazing capacity for revenge." (276) At best minimum comp. testing can only test what were the minimum skills for living in the past, they can't address the skills essential for coping with the demands of the future; these tests "have the potential to smother good teachers under an oppressive blanket of homogenized curriculum and monotonous instruction." Because they're focused on the bottom-level achievers, they drain off the enthusiasm and excitment that should and could exist in both students and teachers, esp. among the brightest students. The continued emphasis on competency testing "risks ... institutionalizing mediocrity by permanently substituting minimums for maximums and thereby removing musch of the incentive for local schools to seek excellence."

(277) But Down calls "the American passion for anything that sounds utilitarian" the most "insidious killer" of ed. excellence; the time has passed when a high school ed. can prepare students for jobs has outlived its time; the "rudimentary skills" useful in the entry level job fast become obsolete; as jobs and technology change at an ever increasingly pace, the ability to absorb new information, analyze and adapt are the kinds of skills most necessary to workers; only a liberal education can provide these intellectual abilities. As historian Paul Gagnon put it: "the French have decided that neither the problems of the moment nor the influx of the massed requires the abandonment of academic content. And that, to the contrary, the more technological our world becomes, the more necessary is a liberal education for everyone. (278) They say that even the lifelong career retraining that modern technology demands will require more, not less, general knowledge and personal sophistication. The technological society, with its threat of alienation or boredom at work and its promise of limitless leisure, has now finally made indispensable to everyone a richly furnished mind."

Until we deal with the 3 killers of excellence, all the changes urged in the structure of ed. probably won't make any difference; or maybe they will deliver "a new version of mdeiocrity masquerading as excellence." Education, not training, is what we need to turn our attention to. "The burden of defining excellence must rest primarily on local school officials," and in the process, they are going to meet with opposition and pressure from conservative interests who will insist on continuing to "provide excellence for the few and

training for the many." State legislators need to find the "political courage" to get rid of the comp. testing laws; once they do this, teachers won't feel they have to teach to these tests, and will be free to devote their time and energy to helping students develop critical thinking and strive for excellence; [he lists a few other changes in teachers' contracts and responsibilities and those of professors].

The federal gov. also has a role to play; starting with the Reagan admin., there has been the sense that while the ed. crisis is a national emergency, (290) the states should pick up the tab for its solution; "What can one say about a president who proposes to stem the tide of mediocrity by enacting a school prayer program?" Leadership, not politicking, is essential, and from the White House down to the local level. Without it, no one will be able to muster the courage necessary for the kinds of changes involved.

(280) "Make no mistake about this: excellence will test our patience, our courage, our willingness to sacrifice. For this nation to sustain its rededication to excellence, our leaders must transcend the proponents of selfish interests, the defenders of minimum competency testing, and the advocates of narrow utility. Any lesser commitment will frustrate school reform and threaten the survival of democracy. That is the challenge of excellence."

8. Hendrick, Irving G., The Education of Non-whites in California, San Francisco: R & E Research Associates, 1977

Subjects: segregation, integration

Notes: (1) Prior to the American period, the missions were the only form of institutionalized education in Calif. While the Mexican governors generally wanted to establish some form of school system, they lacked the power and resources this would have taken and there were too few literate people to serve as teachers. (3) H.H. Bancroft observed that the miners were an "ultra-democratic" bunch in all matters except "race prejudice." (4) "The most extreme irony is that almost overnight Hispano Americans were transformed from a position of equality - even dominance - to one os subjugation and intimidation .... Mexicans immediately were perceived as the most numerous gruop of non-white foreigners and early became the targets of most indignities accorded to Chinese and Negroes."

(5) Perhaps because they shared, to some extent, a common heritage with whites, blacks were better prepared to cope with Calif. conditions than the Mexicans, Indians or Chinese. While discrimination against blacks was blatant, they succeeded against the odds. A study in 1855 found "the colored residents of Calif. are in proportion to their numbers, the least recipients of public charity of any class in the State." The 4815 blacks surveyed held $2.4 million, despite the handicaps they endured, which in some cases included having to purchase their freedom. Agriculture, business, real estate and mining were chief sources of income; (6) in SF, home of about 10% of the blacks then, nearly 20% were cooks; others worked as laborers, waiters, stewards, porters, barbers, sewing women, mechanics, and business men. This relative wealth gave them a greater stake in Calif. than other non-white groups.

(8) It seems clear that although only white children were permitted to attend public schools for most of the 1850s, not all counties must have gone along with this, given Moulder's nasty remarks. He criticized the "Negrophilist school of mock philanthropists." "In several of the counties attempts have been made to introduce children of Negroes into our public school on an equality with whites." He warned against "amalgamation" of the races, saying that if blacks were allowed to attend, soon whites would leave the schools altogether. But blacks "showed an interest in education at least comparable to the interest demonstrated by whites," according to Hendrick.

(9) The second state "convention of colored citizens" in 1856, which brought 61 delegates from 17 counties adopted a resolution that, "the common law, and the common school, are the only hope of a free and enlightened people; the former their shield, and the latter, their guide; and no people can be prosperous and happy who are deprived of these inestimable rights of God to Man."

The first AME church in SF was organized at the corner of Jackson and Virginia streets (St. Cyprian), where in 1854 the first colored school was established. It had an 11 foot ceiling, measureed 50 by 25 feet in size; and was supposedly well light, well ventilated and had finished walls [this sounds a far cry from Supt. Tait's later description, same school?]. John Moore was its first teacher.

Mrs. Elizabeth Thorn Scott started the first colored school in Sac'to, teaching out of her home [she wasn't married then, was she?] Jeremiah Sanderson soon took over, and petitioned the school board for public funds for the school; (10) the school board gave some small allotments, but for over a year, only subsidized the school which plack parents continued to partly support, this "quasi-public school" status continued for several years.

9. Herrick, W.F. and Octavian Hoogs, San Francisco Almanac, 1859, San Francisco: Herrick and Hoogs, 1858

Subjects: Sacramento, Stockton, early schools

Notes: (155) "Public Schools" [information presumably applies to 1857-58] School supt.: W.T. Gibson; Board of trustees: V.M. Peyton, T.J. Keys, G.A. Shurtleff;
[info. from the school census?]
No. of children ages to 18: 454
No. of children under age 4: 257
No. of children born in Calif: 288
No. of children who are orphans: 6
No. of children deaf and dumb: 1
"Average attendance upon the public schools: 190.
Teachers: Male Grammar School: W.T.A. Gibson;
Female Grammar School: Miss Lucy A. Grove; Male Primary School: L. Thaxton; Female Primary School: Miss Pyre. The public school system bagan in Stockton in Fall, 1853, with about "40 scholars in attendance."

(129) Sacramento schools: Franklin School House, corner of 6th and L, 2 story building; the basement housed the Primary School, prin. Mrs. F.M. Ross, and teachers Miss Nelson and Miss Fanny Howe. On the

first floor, Union Grammar School, Prin. J.W. Wells, teachers Miss C.K. Pratt and Mrs. F.W. Thayer. The second story housed the Sac'to High School; the building cost $16,800; open hours 9 am-4 pm.

Board of education: District 1: G.J. Phelan, pres., A.G. Richardson; District 2: J.J. Bidleman, secy, David Meeker; District 3: T.M. Morton, M.D., N.P.Osborne; District 4: G.J.N. Morell; vacancy

[how was it that married teachers worked in these schools? why did each need its own prin? check for enrollment figures; why were there 4 districts?]

[**c917.9461 S19A, CSL]

10. Hittell, Theodore, The History of California, San Francisco: N.J. Stone and Co., 1897

Subjects: Spanish period, first schools

Notes: (v. 1:595) Spanish Gov. Diego De Borica, "may be called the founder of secular schools in Calif." He cites a letter to the commandante of the guard in San Jose, Dec. 17, 1794, regarding contributions to pay the teacher Manuel Vargas; that he hopes to est. a school to teach religion, reading and writing [in Spanish, of course]; but according to Hittell, he got no response. So, in July, 1795, he ordered the San Jose alcalde to compel the colonists to send their children to school and pay the teacher 2 1/2 reals per child per month in tuition; Hittell goes on to describe other acts through which Borica sought to convince colonists it was in their interest to send their children to school.

(v.2:722) First Am. school opened in SF Apr. 3, 1848, and closed because of gold fever; it reopened Dec. 1848, on Portsmouth Square, called the Public Institute [he cites Soule, 200,207, obviously working with a different edition, but this doesn't agree with what Soule says either].

(v.2:768) the ed. provisions of the 1849 constitution were approved without much change or debate; (850) details on delay of the school tax [see also Calif. Journals, 1 Sess. 1223, 1239].

(v.3:412) 1853-in SF. there were 10 public schools, 21 teachers and 1250 students.

(v.4:80) Gov. Bigler was wrong in declaring "a judicious system of common schools [had been] devised" in 1850-51, it wasn't, according to Hittell. (84) Gov. John McDougal advocated public ed. as a means of integrating immigrants and attracting families: "We have the means within our reach of establishing upon this western soil the most magnificant system of ed. in the world....an honor to the public and a blessing to the people." 6-10 million acres of swamp and overflow lands were set aside for reclamation and sale, the proceeds going to schools. (177-8) Gov. Bigler advocated changing the constitution to eliminate the state supt. of public instruction among other offices [see also Sen. Journal, 1856:24-29]; (293) Gov. Stanford advocated generous support of educational institutions; (297-298) Under Stanford,the "war governor," ac act was passed in 1862 to fund the issue of arms to students in colleges and academies and teach them military tactics [see also Sen. Journal 1862:99-100 and 1862 Stats. 483]. Also in 1862, election of Supt. of public instruction changed from every two to every four years [Stats. 581-588].

11. Low, Victor, The Unimpressible Race: A Century of Educational Struggle by the Chinese in San Francisco, San Francisco: East/West Publishing Company, 1982

Subjects: Chinese schools, segregation, integration, court cases Pelton, Swett, Moulder, Denman

Notes: (6) Race was first mentioned in Calif. school law in 1855, specifying "white children" would be subject to the school census; a school for black children had been established in 1854, and by 1857, a school for Chinese children was considered by the SF school board (7) its purpose: to "Americanize the Chinamen"; the SF colored school was only a primary school, (8) in 1858, a black child named Lester was admitted into the SF high school stimulating debate over their admission to public schools other than colored schools; the board resolved to deny colored children admission, and Lester was removed from the high school.
(11) John Swett, however, had allowed black children to attend the Rincon School where he was principal during the 1850's to 1862-so when he ran for state supt. of public instruction, he was charged with being an "abolitionist with amalgamating proclivities." When complaints were made, SF school supt. Henry B. Janes did a survey and found black children attending four public schools including Rincon, and the students were removed and sent to the colored school; On Aug. 23, 1859, Chinese parents petitioned the SF school board for a primary school; one was formed and opened Sept. 12, 1859-called the Chinese School; (14) it happened so fast because Rev. Speer donated a room in his church for the school; Mr. Lanctot was the first teacher, and earned $75 per month; within 4 months, however, the school was closed, according to the board, because of lack of funds; the SF Evening Bulletin editor complained about this excuse: "we are convinced that it is a mistaken policy--a piece of two penny economy. It seems a great pity....Chinamen are required to pay school taxes. It is but decent that they should have some remuneration for their taxes. Certainly it is not to our credit that heathens, for whom we afford no educational advantages, should help to school our children. The glory of the Free School System is that it extends its privileges to all, white or black, outside barbarians or the tailed Celestials--to any who have, by the most charitable construction, a soul or an intellect than ranks above instinct." [12/31/1853:3] Other newspapers also complained, and the board was persuaded to reopen the school.

(15) On April 17, 1860, SF Supt. James Denman visited the school and reported to the board that so few children attended that he questioned the "justice and propriety of expending the public funds to sustain this school, when those for whom it was established manifest so little interest in availing themselves of its advantages." [SF Evening Bulletin, 4/18/1860:3] The school was closed the following July.

(17) Under state supt. Moulder, the 1860 school law became overtly racist: "Negroes, Mongolians and Indians shall not be admitted into the public schools; and whenever satisfactory evidence is furnished...to show that said prohibited parties are attending such schools [funds may be withheld]."

(19) When John Swett took office as state supt., his goal, according to Low, was "free education for all." Swett wrote: "If all classes pay taxes on their property for the support of the schoos, there is no reason why the children of all classes, whether white, black, tawney, or copper-colored, should not be educated." [First Biennial Report, 1864-65:57]; (20) Under Swett's influence, the annual school census included non-white children after 1863; his revision of the 1864 school law removed the punishment by withholding school funds from schools admitting nonwhite students; it required forming schools for nonwhites when parents of ten or more students petitioned and where fewer than ten children were involved, allowed their admission into public schools; (22) the Chinese school in SF operated sometimes during the period 1861-66.

(23) While in operation, Benino Lanctot was appointed the first teacher of the Chinese school, a man opposed by the Chinese for concentrating more on religious instruction than education; (24) they secured his removal, and he was replaced by a former teacher of a private Chinese school, Wm. Dye, but Lanctot protested to the SF school board, who suspended the Chinese school while it investigated Dye. John Pelton was elected supt of SF schools in 1866, and as the "most progressive" of SF supts. during the 19th century, he urged the reopening of the school. (25) In his 1867 annual report he wrote that only 37 of 179 elegible Chinese children were attending school, and that this was "a striking instance of taxation without representation; a principle and practice which we are accustomed to condemn as wrong." He went so far as to suggest the combining of Chinese and regular public schools, with the addition of Chinese language classes to take advantage of the diversity of students and language skills of their teachers; he also supported the hiring of a Chinese teacher, Choy Cum Chew. (26) But Pelton lost in the next election, and James Denman once again became the supt. and continued his fight against the Chinese school; while the school reopened with Dye as teacher in 1868, he quit over a salary dispute and Lanctot was rehired; he quit early in 1871, and the school was closed again.

(27) Denman used the school law of 1870 as a device to keep the school closed; the law had been rewritten including African and Indian children but no mention was made of Chinese or Mongolians; while he cited reasons of poor attendance and lack of funds, Low (pp. 30-37) refutes his excuses; however, there was plenty of support for racial hatred of the Chinese at that time, (38-48) Low calls 1871-84 "the exclusion years." Despite petitions from Chinese parents to city and state officials, there was strong resistance to educating Chinese students. (48) The school law of 1874 again included only African and Indian children; while Chinese could have been educated under this law, no schools were established for them and they were excluded from regular public schools on the basis of the "children of filthy or vicious habits..." clause of the law.

(50-51) The new SF supt. J.H. Widber, in 1873, included writing samples of 1st and 2nd graders' work that were used as grammar and punctuation exam material that year. The writing samples clearly demonstrate the way adult prejudices are passed along to children. "Chinese are of no importance to SF, they take away a great deal of labor from our people, because they work cheaper and not so good....Chinese are employed all together, there were many working during the building of these great railroad's, in the mountain's and during the snow blockade's. There are a great many coming and going

from here on the Chinese steamer's, and when they get here that is the time for the Express men for cheating them and making them pay double the price for riding....[they] can be seen daily over the hill's carrying there basket's loaded with vegetables and fruit to sell to people where these Italian's do not go with there wagons because it is to steep for the horse's to pull up. there is a great quantity exported from China. In the shape of tea's." and
"In SF, there is about nine thousand Chinamen who only pay about one-half as much taxes on property; as one man in this city. I think it shall ruin United States." [second example from second grade, see 1873 report for additional selections; mistakes in original, but not abbrev. of SF]

(52-8) Denman continued to keep the Chinese school closed on the excused of the earlier lack of interest by the Chinese, but cited no evidence except his own assertions, used in one annual report after another; calls by the Chinese were echoed by some in the press and clergy, but all were denied.

(59-60) Moulder followed as SF supt. again, in time to receive Mamie Tape's request for admission into regular public school; he called on state supt. Welcker for his opinion, and Wekcker said he didn't think federal courts had the power to force the state to educated Chinese students, which he saw as "dangerous to the well-being of the State." Moulder and the majority of the SF school board agreed and denied Tape's admission despite the threatened lawsuit. Superior court judge Maguire ruled they couldn't keep American-born Chinese out of public schools, or to bar any children education on the basis of race or color; (63) ironically, one board member said Prin. Hurley would be fired if she admitted Mamie Tape to school; (64) Moulder protested the decision calling the Chinese a "nation of liars" and "filthy and impure." Mar. 3, 1885, the Calif. supreme court confirmed Maguire's decision, the decision read in part: "respondent here has the same right to enter a public school that any other child has." In the meantime, however, Moulder had forseen the court would uphold the earlier decision and moved to reestablish a segregated Chinese school so Tape could be excluded from the regular school; to do so, he had to get the state law revised, and he did so by getting SF state senator Lynch to introduce a revision under the "urgency provision"; Moulder and state supt. (67) Ira Hoit both attended sessions in Sac'to to encourage passage of the bill, which read in part: "and also to establish separate schools for children of Mongolian or Chinese descent. When such separate schools are established Chinese or Mongolian children must not be admitted into any other schools."

(69) When Tape went to try and attend school, Prin. Hurley denied her admission, first because she had no vaccination cert., then because of a rule limiting class size to 60 students, which she pointed out was already exceeded. (70) Moulder urder the SF school board to stop stalling on establishing a separate school (they'd been balking at supplying desks and other equipment as being too expensive) and the board moved to act. (71) Chinese school opened on Apr. 13, 1885 with teacher Rose Thayer. (72-3) Chinese parents were not quick to send their children to the new school however, and kept them in private schools or sent them to China to be educated. (74 ff.) Anti-Chinese prejudice continued to grow, and Moulder fueled its rise, in speaking to school principals, he said they owed their white students "active efforts to save the rising generation from

contamination and pollution by a race reeking with the vices of the Orient, a race that knows neither truth, principle, modesty, nor respect for our laws..."

(77) In 1886, Chinese parents still viewed the Chinese Primary School with distrust; by Nov. 1886, the school had an enrollment of of between 24 and 38 students, which included 3 girls; (78 ff.) [more on the problems faced by the Chinese school and students, including the difficulties encountered in locating adequate quarters; whites protested several locations saying property valued would fall by about 25%, that if they used a certain building for a school, students should only leave and enter through the alley, and protested students being taught to use the front stairs in case of fire.

(84-85) Wong Him v. Callahan--protested the continued operation of segregated schools for Chinese only; filed in U.S. curcuit court June 18, 1902; judge Seawell denied the petition; (86) the court upheld the principle established in Plessy v. Ferguson which accepted the doctrine of separate but equal.

(98) After the 1906 quake, segregation became even stronger; in 1909 the state legislature amended the school law to read: "The governing body of the school district shall have power to exclude children of filthy or vicious habits, or children suffering from contagious or infectious diseases, and also to establish separate schools for Indian children and for children of Chinese or Mongolian descent. When such separate schools are established, ... [these] children must not be admitted into any other school."

(107) In 1917, a study of the SF school system by the U.S. Commissioner of Ed. found several problems with the "Oriental School": the school kept no records of birthplace; study plans weren't adjusted to the special needs of the students; many students didn't speak English, yet were offered the same course of study as given in white public schools; (108) Mary Bo-Tze Lee also criticized the school in her master's thesis, "Problems of the Segregated School for Asiatics in SF." She found about $10 less per capita was spent on the Chinese students; that teachers often failed to understand the Chinese language and culture; (109) that children weren't grouped by ability; and that there were no rules about the use of English during school hours. Low notes the similarity between her observations and recommendations made by Pelton in the 1860s, that ironically would not be carried out for another 50 years after the court decision in Lau v. Nichols.

(189) Lau cites John Pelton among all the school supts. of SF for his efforts to improve educational opportunities for the Chinese; he also praises Rev. Otis Gibgon, Donaldina Cameron, and Claudia White. Lau points out that although all non-whites were subjected to prejudical laws and treatment, that he found no evidence of the groups drawing together to protest their common plight; he speculates "differences among the races and the harsh social and economic pressures forestalled any collective action."

While Chinese schools were grudgingly established and maintained, Chinese teachers were few in number; an unofficial quota existed to limit their participation and when they were hired, it was often to teach non-Chinese students, while white teaches who spoke no Chinese predominated in Chinese schools.

(190) Lau notes the importance of preserving cultural pluralism, observing that bilingual ed., as presently conceived, is based on a compensatory model, and he'd prefer a maintenance and enrichment model

where non-English languages are continued and offered to those who do not have the language but would like to acquire it; he suggests this could be done with little cost in schools with a large language-minority enrollment.

(191) Questions for future research: 1) Where were other segregated Chinese schools established, and were they publicly supported? 2) Were Chinese language schools in SF Chinatown formed to perpetuate the language or to prepare students for work in China? 3) Work should be done in the archives of protestant churches were private schools were often held. 4) Work should be done on the education of children of Chinese families who relocated to Berkeley or Oakland after the 1906 quake. 5) PTA minutes in North Beach school district and the records of Italian papers there should be studied for information about the admission of Chinese Am. students before the Brown decision. 6) How can schooling be changed to meet the needs of the current and future students of Chinese descent, who differ a great deal from earlier Chinese students.

(192) Lau argues that language minorities must "seize the initiative" rather than merely reacting to their conditions; and in part this means "demystifying the 'good old days' of schooling, defining and embracing those values and customs that affirm one's identity, maintaining vigilance over school texts that perpetuate stereotypes or have serious omissions of minority Americans, and participating in the politics of education to ensure the systematic transmission of minority heritages as well as to humanize American public education." He charges "The most fundamental obstacle is the educational bureaucracy."

12. Moulder, Andrew J., Commentaries on the School Law with the Elements of School Architecture, Sacramento: State Printer, 1858

Subjects: school law, architecture, purpose of education

Notes: The 1855 school law states: "The School Law, An Act to establish, support, and regulate Common Schools...passed May 3, 1855. Sec. 3 [duties of the State Supt.] "SEcond, By all proper means in his power to disseminate intellignece among the people in relation to the method and value of education" (3-4).

(103) "Thought-Springs" a section of quotations related to education and its purpose. He observes the obligation to educate poor children "the masses." (104) "Numerous have been the instances illustrative of the fact, that the greatest scourges of our race are men of gigantic cultivated intellect. Where knowledge but qualifies its possessor for influcting misery, ignorance would indeed be bliss." (Prof. Mayhew) It's essential that a heart and conscience are also necessary to be ed'd.

(106) "Let it be borne in mind, that all the children in every community will be educated somewhere and somehow; and it devolves upon citizens and parents to determine whether the children of the present generation shall receive their training in THE SCHOOL HOUSE or IN THE STREETS; and if in the former, whether in good or poor schools." (Prof. Mayhew)

(107) Ed. increases the productivity of labor (Horace Mann); it's in the interest of property owners to see that all are educated

(Horace Greeley); (108) ed. decreases poverty and crime; it's necessary to politics; (110) it's the duty of the state; (111) it decreases crime.

[**c379.1M92 CSL; many diagrams of school room layouts, sketches of desks, very nice illustrations, possibly useful for exhibit]

13. Neustadt, Richard E. and Ernest R. May, Thinking in Time: The Uses of History for Decision Makers, New York: Free Press , 1986

Subjects: decision making; case studies; policy

Notes: Purpose of the book: how to use experience: to present alternatives to public policy decision making (from here on, abbreviated as "d-m") through an examination of the past. An important caveat to using the past as a model: the written record is only a portion, maybe a misleading portion, of what happened. The authors make three explicit assumptions: context matters and shapes the outcome of ideological and other forces; small improvements in d-m matter; even a little thought can help temper the perennial "ebullient can-doism" with which we have faced decisions in the past.

1. A familiar claim is that d-m'ers are just too busy to read, they already have too much information to ponder; this is complicated by the common desire to ACT--to do SOMETHING now. Delaying action may be the wisest course in some situations. The past can be useful as more than just analogy-when analogies are suggested, they should be subjected to scrutiny: do they really apply in the given situation? Look closely at the particulars of the current issue, at its roots and context. Robt. A. Lovett: "Good judgment is usually the result of experience. And experience is frequently the result of bad judgment." Imagine the perspective of the opposition. Pay attention to organizational histories and their tendency to act as they have in the past. Summary: Using history to guide action involves analysis of the substantive, procedural, organizational and personal histories involved.

2. Awareness of the history of an issue can expose underlying presumptions and make them available for examination: do they fit the present-day conditions? Are they appropriate to the current situation? Some elements of an issue's history are more intractable than others, and more impervious to solution, so decisions made may need readjustment, in the light of future circumstances. "Better d-m involves drawing on history to frame sharper questions and doing so systematically, routinely." But analysis is not the only appropriate use of history, it's also important as the basis of advocacy.

The "usual" use of history in policy making has 6 elements: 1. headlong rush into action; 2. over use of vague analogies; 3. a lack of knowledge about the issue's actual history; 4. failure to reflect on presumptions about people and organizations; 5. acting on the basis of stereotypes; 6. failure to seriously consider alternatives and inability to see decisions as a part of the larger history of an issue or problem: acting as though the choice made on this occasion will end the issue once and for all.

14. Pelton, John Cotter, Life's Sunbeams and Shadows: Poems and Prose with Appendix, San Francisco: Bancroft, 1893

Subjects: Pelton, first schools, teacher biography

Notes: Appendix A (autobiograhpical notes) (199) Born "cradled in poverty" and "early inured to all the toil and the suffering of unprovided orphanage, and an almost friendless boyhood in Madrid, Phillips, New Sharon, and Farmington, Franklin County, Maine." He visited public schools whenever he could and "listened to school recitations, and to the teacher's instruction with sympathy and love both for teacher and the pupils; and this early led me to a life ambition to become a teacher myself" which he did about age 18. (200) Beginning salary about $10 per month; he heard about John Fremont's adventures in the West and longed to go there too.

(201) News of the gold discovery reached him while principal of Phillips' Free School, Andover, Mass. (203) He decided he "would establish Public Schools; there be a school master without interference, and employ my own methods in my own way." So he called on some friends and told them of his dream, and they helped him out with letters of recommendation, encouragement, books, maps, globes, school furniture, and a grand school bell cast with the words "Presented to the First Free Grammar School of San Francisco, by Henry N. Hooper & Company, Boston, Massachusetts." Unfortuantely, the bell was destroyed in one of the early San Francisco fires before a school could be built. He married a woman who shared his dream, and they sailed to California.

They arrived in San Francisco without a penny, having paid their last $1.50 to be carried ashore. (218) However, he took over the ship's load of rice at 4 cents a pound, and sold it for 11 cents a pound, a profit of about $400 for a days' work. He quickly found out how expensive life would be there. But he petitioned the Ayuntamiento "A communication from John C. Pelton, stating his designs in regard to establishing free Public Schools, was submitted by committee on education with recommendation in favor of action on the part of city authorities for the establishment of a Public School." [strange that he doesn't list Leidesdorff as among his supporters] he does include John Geary, Henry Dodge, Wm. Howard, Samuel Brannan, Capt. Macondray, Wm H. David, Wm. Coleman and others.

(219) Coleman, Chas. L. Ross, A.B.Hatch, John F. Pope and O.C. Wheeler helped him get the First Baptist church on Washington near Stockton st. rent free, equivalent rooms in another location would have cost at least $500 per month; (219-220 quotes statement he advertised for the school "Opening of the First Public School, Dec. 26, 1849") The following day, the Pacific News published an editorial entitled "A Free Public School." It acknowledged the "movement in favor of education" begun by Pelton, who came recommended by Mass. Gov. Briggs and others "for his high moral character, and for his skill in the regualtion of a school, and the imparting of instruction, without which no teacher can succeed. We can but express our sincere hope that his laudable efforts may be crowned with success."

(221) 3 boys came the first day: Charles Cushing, Cornelius Makin and Davis Louderback. They opened with daying the Lord's Prayer and sang several songs: "America," "Star Spangled Banner," "Silvery Tide" etc. "As to the Lord's Prayer, I think it a grave mistake that this part of the 'opening exercises' should ever have been omitted in

the city and state schools." The second day, about 30 boys and girls showed up. (222) The first few months, expenses were paid by private sources, and no salaries paid. March 28, 1850, Talbot H. Greene introduced a resolution to pay Pelton $500 per month and to limit the class to 100 students. (223) School operated 830 am to noon and 2 to 5 pm Mon. through Fri. The class limit was set aside, and Pelton advised to admit all those who applied, "over 300 enrolled, with three extra teachers employed and paid by myself,--with a promise of reimbursement, which never came."

(224)First School Report, May 4, 1850: 77 students from U.S. and 75 foreign students: Australia and Chile each 20, New Zealand 15, England and Ireland each 5, Scotland 4, Sandwich Islands 3, Germany France and Peru each 1. (225 ff.) He discusses most important 'first school' events like May Day celebrations, esp. Admission Day, Sept. 9, 1850, [see Pacific News] with the banner honoring Pelton's school, etc.; talks about early efforts to pass a school law and the few friends of education in the legislature. (230) He temporarily retired from teaching.

(231) Pelton was the first county supt. of schools in San Fransciso, and the first city/county supt. after consolidation; in 1865 he was again elected supt. (232) he chaired the first teacher's meeting in the city and state; wrote the first public school reports; sat as a trustee of the first state reform school and was its first supt. and later supt. of the first San Francisco industrial school; he wrote "the San Francisco cosmopolitan school system was my own conception from a former experimental school, organized and kept at my own expense." He served as prinicpal at Washington st., Bush St. (now Denman), Rincon, Lincoln, and Hyde St. schools and sub-master at Mission and Union schools.

He had two regrets over his career: he once punished a boy too severely then found out it was the wrong boy; he allowed the transfer of Ira G. Hoitt from Lincoln School, which (233) looked like an act of "getting even." (238, Note B) He disputes John Swett's history of California schools when Swett wrote that Pelton's school was free only to indigent children. No tuition was charged or received. (239-240) summarizes his complaints against Col. T.J. Nevins who ignored all Pelton had done once he got into the office for which Pelton had supported him; he's still angry at Swett for not having corrected the record Nevins helped falsify or ignore.

Chronology (247) 12/3/1849, Daily Pacific News, first announcement by Pelton on establishing the first free public school; 2/20/1850, ? first Comm. on Education appointed, first city land set aside for public school use and first public school ordinanace proposed all after suggestions by Pelton ? [he says these were before the Common Council, maybe this is a later incarnation of the town council under which the 3 Williams formed the school comm.]; (248) The first public school seal of San Francisco county has Pelton's name under the impression [check municipal reports]; Pelton complains: "But 29 years of Public School and similar active work finally found me wrecked in health, and a financial zero."

15. Phillips, George H., The Enduring Struggle: Indians in California History, San Francisco: Boyd and Fraser Publishing, 1981

Subjects: Indian schools

Notes: First six chapters briefly sketch Indian life under Spanish, Mexican and Anglo rule. Good maps; (50) shows the vast difference between lands ceded to the Indians under treaties versus lands actually reserved--looks like less than 10%. (52) "Because of white settler opposition, legal entanglements, and governmental equivocation, however, the Indians of Calif. became paupers instead of planters."

(63) Charges the federal govt. with such neglect that Calif. in effect developed its own Indian policy--and the Indians got far less than awarded under the initial treaties; while under the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, 1848, Indians should have been eligible for citizenship, Calif. moved quickly to restrict their rights, denying them the right to vote, serve on juries, or testify in court against white; because of the great desparity between lands ceded and those actually reserved for Indians, few in Calif. lived on reservations;

In 1909 the BIA operated 4 boarding and 18 reservation day schools, along with the Sherman Insitute training school, with about 2000 students out of about 3700 who were school age. Elsie Allen, a Pomo born near Santa Rose in 1899 recounts her experience in a BIA school where she went in 1910 at age 11: "I had received no education up until I was eleven and it was in that year that I was taken away from my family and sent to Covelo in northeastern Mendocino County, where there was an Indian Reservation with an Indian school. A government agent came to see us and talked my mother into letting me go to that place, which was about 80 miles away from where we lived....

"At the Covelo Indian School they placed me in a dormitory (64) with other Indian girls. At that time I could not yet speak English, and soon found myself unable to follow simple dressing and eating chores of the daily existence because we children were not supposed to speak Indian, a rule of most government Indian schools at that time....They tried to keep me busy by giving me cards that had holes in them through which I was supposed to twist some yarn. It seemed so useless. Worst of all this dormitory was burned down one night, the fire believed to have been started by some older girls who hated the school, and I lost nearly all my clothes that my mother had so carefully packed and sent with me.

"We had to move to a boy's dormitory and there I was forced to wear boy's clothes. We were given various duties to do, but it was hard for me to understand and sometimes I was punished when I did them wrong because of lack of understanding the language....My stay at Covelo was not vey fruitful because of this language barrier, and I often cried at night with homesickness."

The poor quality of Indian schools discouraged students and parents interested having their children attend school; some wanted their children to attend state operated schools; the BIA was just as glad to see enrollments decline and the state take over in educating the Indians; most govt' operated schools closed by the 1930s.

16. Purdy, Helen Throop, Portsmouth Square, San Francisco: California Historical Society, 1924

Subjects: San Francisco, first schools, Portsmouth school

Notes: (7) Brannan came to SF in 1846 with 200 Mormons; he published first issue of the Calif. Star newspaper from his house at Dupont and Washington St. on Jan. 7, 1847.

(8) April 1847, the first school opened in a shanty on Dupont between Broadway and Pacific; it soon closed; in 1848, a school opened on the west side of the square, called the Public Institute; Douglas was its first teacher.

[So, although she studied Portsmouth Square, itself, she doesn't indicate that the school in our picture was the same one or in the same place as Brannan's Mormon school; it seems like she would have if they were; it does seem odd that she mentions Brannan's newspaper and his house without mentioning the Mormon school, however.]

San Francisco , Municipal Report, 1865-66, San Francisco, 1866

Subjects: San Francisco, segregation

Notes: [from the Public School Report published in the annual Municipal Report, check-was the school report writeen by the school supt.?? if so this one if by John Pelton; San Francisco City Archives SF Public Library].

(316) This year, there were two colored schools in operation: Broadway Street Colored School, with grammar master S.D. Simonds, at $100/month, and Mrs. G. Washburn, primary asst. at $75/mo. At the Fifth Street Colored School, J.B. Sanderson, who'd been in the dept. 8 years, taught the mixed class and earned $75/mo.

(318) B. Lanctot taught at the Chinese School, had been in the dept. 3 years, and earned $80/mo.

[was Simonds white? If not, why did he earn more than Sanderson? Sanderson must have earned less than Lanctot because Lanctot was white].

San Francisco , Municipal Report, 1866-1867, San Francisco, 867

Subjects: San Francisco, segregation

Notes: [see note 1865-66 Municipal Report, this one must also be Pelton's]

Advocates the establishment of a Cosmopolitan School-where German, French, English and Spanish are taught; State Supt. John Swett wrote a letter May 23, 1867, giving his support to the idea.

(327) Colored School, between Broadway and Mason, Mrs. Georgia Washburn, prin. at $100/mo. and H.F. Byers, asst at $67.50/mo.

(375) "A Chinese School" of 179 children, only 37 attend [private] classes and no scholl for "their special accomodation" [he refers to the closing of the Chinese public school], yet about $14,000 of the $20,000 in taxes the Chinese pay goes for the support of schools, so they are taxed without representation; further, there are probably white children who want to learn Chinese; while the Chinese could go to the Colored School, they refuse.

397 res. corner of Polk and Pine {his res?]

19. San Francisco Board of Education, Report to the Common Council of San Francisco , San Francisco: Whitton, Towne and Co., Sept. 1, 1854

Subjects: San Francisco, colored school

Notes: (17) "School for colored children" recently built at corner of Jackson and Virgnia in basement of St. Cyprian Methodist Episcopal colored church; built and equipped by church patrons, then leased by the city for one year with option to renew for second year, at $50 per month; Mr. J.J. Moore, a black teacher, began teaching May 22 with 23 students, now has 44.

20. San Francisco Board of Education, Annual Report, 1906-1912, San Francisco , 1912

Subjects: Pelton, first schools

Notes: (123) [this must be from a history section] Mar. 25, 1850, "Resolved, that from the first day of April, 1850, John C. Pelton and Mrs. Pelton, his wife, be employed as teachers for the public school, at the Baptist Church, which has been offered to teh Council free of charge, and that the average number of scholars not exceed 100...." The school occupied the Baptist church until a fire there on June 28, 1851.

(126) "Necrology" names Pelton as the founder of the first free public school in SF and Calif. in Dec. 1849; he served as prin. of the SF grammar school, as SF supt. of schools in 1856, '57, and 1865-67. He died March 5, 1911.

21. San Francisco Dept. of Public Schools, Annual Report, 1864, San Francisco, 1864

Subjects: San Francisco, segregation

Notes: (31) "School for Colored Children" new location on Broadway near Powell, has "two large and well-furnished classrooms and two convenient yards for the different sexes." Total enrolled 138, belonging 65, average daily att. 58; the first two months of this year, they were still in the Cyprian Church with just one teacher, but since the school was moved to new quarters, and now had two teachers, ada has been 79.

Since some of these families are "heavy tax-payers" they should have "teachers thoroughly educated and chosen with special reference to the requirements of the school." (53) J.B. Sanderson, prin. and Miss P. Stewart, asst.

22. Soule, Frank, John H. Gihon and James Nisbet., The Annals of San Francisco, Palo Alto: Lewis Osborne, 1854

Subjects: San Francisco, early schools, Portsmouth Square

Notes: (677) "Public Schools" First school in SF "was merely a private enterprise" opened by Mr. Marston in Apr. 1847 in a shanty between Broadway and Pacific, west of Dupont St.; about 20 or 30 students; tuition was charged and the school operated nearly a year, but Marston "possessed none of the qualifications requisite in one of his calling."

"The people of the town at length saw the necessity of some public movement to secure to their children a fit education, and late in 1847, they built a school-house, a representation of which heads this article, on the south-west corner of Portsmouth Square, fronting on Clay street where it is now joined by Brenham Place." [this is in contrast to Arthur Chandler's claim that the Portsmouth Square school was built by Brannan, and that the school in the photo we use was the Mormon school; see Annaleone Patton, CSL, Bio-Letter file, Sam Brannan, she says, donated the land on which this school was built.]

In this school building, "Every new enterprise found here a heating oven to warm the egg into successful hatching." Churches, public amusements, Odd-Fellows and other benevolent assns. met, public hall for political, military and other meetings, a court-house under Judge Almond, "an institute at another period," a police-office and a station-house. [by "institute" does he refer to "Public Institute"?]

(678) Feb 21, 1848-at a town meeting, school board of trustees was elected: Dr. F. Fourgeaud, Dr. J. Townsend, C.L. Rosee, J. Serrine, and Wm. H. Davis. Apr. 3, the school opened in the "building just erected" which Thomas Douglas taught; tuition charged; Marston closed his private school and Douglas got about 40 students [this too supports the view of the Leidesdorff payments going to build this school, see the SF Town Treasurer's record book, notes].

The school went along for about 2 months when gold was discovered. Gold rumors "drove the whole population to such an intensity of excietment, that it resulted in a general stampede of men, women, and children for the 'mines,' leaving the teacher minus pupils, minus trustees and town council, and minus tuition and salary. He, therefore, locked the school-house, and shouldering his pick and pan, himself started for the 'diggins.'"

(679) April 23, 1849, Rev. Albert Williams "obtained the use of the public school-house and opened a private school, charging tuition. [sounds like this may have been in the same Portsmouth Square school]. He got about 25 students and taught until Sept. 20 when his duties at the First Presbyterian Church took up too much of his time and he closed the school.

Dec. 26, John Pelton opened a school in space donated by the Baptist Church, rent free. He furnished equipment, texts, etc. at his own expense; he and Mrs. Pelton, who assisted him, got by on subscriptions and donations supplemented by the profits from the sale of textbooks for several months. In 1850, he petitioned the school board for compensation, which he received, $500 a month, paid in city script. "This was at one time the only school in the city, and numbered 150 pupils in regular attendance, and as it was chiefly supported from the public funds, was called a public school, although the city council had nothing to do with its organization or

management."
(680) the first SF supt of public schools was Col. T.J. Nevins, former agent of the Am. Tract Society; In June, 1850, Messrs. Mellus and Howard donated the use of a building in Happy Valley near Mission and 2nd st. Its first teacher was Samuel Newton, from Conn., he only lasted a few months, and was succeeded by several men, none of whom lasted very long--Lewellyn Rogers, Mr. Cooley, Mr. Hyde; the school was financed by voluntary contributions mostly until 1851 [?] when the town council appropriated money for a teacher salary and named the school the "Happy Valley Public School."
[680-681 seems to be some confusion here or in my notes about this school versus Pelton's]; in Jan. 1851, Nevins got a 50 vara lot at Spring Valley on Presidio Road and built a large building mostly at private expense, hired a teacher and opened a "free school" that for the first quarter of operations was completely supported by private donations [does this go with above Rogers, and the rest?].

23. Tait, George, Annual Report of the Supt. of San Francisco, San Francisco: , 1864

Subjects: San Francisco, segregation

Notes: Schools in SF were Girls High, Boys High, City Normal School, Chinese School (at Sacramento and Stockton), 6 grammar schools, 13 primary schools, Colored School (Broadway betw. Powell and Mason), Model School, State Normal School (on post near Kearny);
(37) Sex segregation: in Chicago and Buffalo, no segregation of the sexes even in high school; in New York City and Brooklyn, separate make and female depts, use different floors in the same building; in Cincinnati, sexes divided by class or grade; Boston is mixed: 20 grammar schools with 7 for boys, 7 for girls and 6 mixed schools.
In SF-no sex segregation until last May when the board organized Boys High and Girls High to provide different classes; for example, the girls got no ancient languages, higher math or minerology; Denman school has segregation with boys and girls in different classes.
(45) Gives enrollment by school, Chinese had 119 and Colored 138; their attendance figures were about 90 per cent, approximately the same as other SF schools.

24. Tyack, David, Robert Lowe and Elisabeth Hansot, Public Schools in Hard Times: The Great Depression and Recent Years, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1984

Subjects: school boards, public school history

Notes: ON SCHOOL BOARDS - (56) "Study after study has shown that the members of school boards came mostly from the upper reaches of the social structure in their communities, especially in towns and cities." But while most were businessmen, this does not mean they all thought alike, or pursued some class interest they all shared. Tyack et al. speculate that probably board members for the most part leave the day-to-day school operation to the educators, not much interested

in what goes on. "Even elite politics of ed. had a pluralistic cast. During the Depression in Detriot, board members fought to save school programs, while in Chicago, budgets were slashed; the Elmtown, Ill. board sought to make "teacher sconform, in the classroom and in their personal lives, to the most conservative economic, political, religious, and moral doctrines prevailing in the community."

(56) During the Depression, where educators sought progressive school reforms, the business elites who dominated school boards stood in the way of changes; reformers hoped to replace elites with members representing a cross section of community interests, not just those based on property, so "teachers could deal honestly with the economic problem" [National Educational Policy," Social Frontier 1(Oct. 1935):3-4].

25. Wollenberg, Charles , All Deliberate Speed: Segregation and Exclusion in California Schools (1/3 continued), Berkeley: University of California Press, 1976

Subjects: segregation, integration, court cases

Notes: AFRICAN-AMERICANS-(9) In 1852, about 2200 blacks in Calif.; by mid-1850's, most lived in the leading cities, San Francisco, Sacramento and Stockton, many worked as laborers or provided services; some were miners; most came from northeastern U.S. (10) As a group, blacks were relatively well off, the rate of pauperism among blacks only half that among whites; most were literate, and unwilling to accept an inferior status without question. They organized politically, and held annual conventions in Sacramento starting in the mid 50's to remove laws limiting their freedom.

In 1854 parents of black children petitioned in San Francisco ed. in public schools; first public school for blacks opened in the basement of the St. Cyprian Church near Jackson and Virginia Streets with 45 registered students. (11) By 1860, about 100 were registered there. School supt. George Tait complained about conditions in this school, and called for a new building. By 1873, the state had 21 public colored schools, a few private ones, and a short-lived boarding secondary school in San Jose, Phoenixonia Institute.

With the creation of colored schools, a group of influential black teachers emerged, but not all had black teachers. Sara Brown, daughter of abolutionist John Brown, taught the colored school in Red Bluff. Jeremiah Sanderson was among the best known black teachers, (12) starting in Sac. in 1854, he moved to a teaching position in SF and in 1863 was promoted to principal there; in 1868 he transferred to Stockton; although he had such a fine reputation that students were sent from all over the state to attend his Stockton school, he earned only $60 per month compared to $75 paid to white men.

1855-Calif. law changed to include race; with school funds distributed according to the number of white students; (13) State Supt. Andrew Jackson Moulder, from Virginia attacked the idea of mixed race schools, "to force African, Chinses and Diggers into one school...must result in the ruin of the schools. The great mass of our citizens will not associate in terms of equality with these inferior races; nor will they consent that their children do so." [1859 Annual Report, 14-15]. An 1863 law allowed the withholding of

funds from schools that enrolled nonwhite students. (14) State law allowed, but did not require districts to establish schools for nonwhites using school funds.

This gradually changed during the 1860s, since the discrimination became associated with anti-Union sentiment. In 1864 the law required districts to provide separate schools for "Negroes, Mongolians and Indians" when parents to 10 or more children petitioned the school board. In 1866, in districts with less than 10 colored children where no separate school existed, such children were allowed to attend the white school as long as most white parents failed to make a written protest.

State Supt. John Swett was a leader in liberalizing school laws. (15) When he first ran for office in 1862, his Democratic opponents printed flyers accusing him of being an abolitionist and of allowing mixed classes at Rincon School where blacks and whites were "'taught and classed in terms of equlaity.'" While Swett didn't advocate mixed schools, he continued to encourage public education for nonwhites.

(21) Ward v. Flood-The Colored Citizens Comm. wanted to pursue a test case to change the state policy and John W. Dwinelle, a prominent white SF attorney, agreed to take such a case. Fund raising for legal expenses began, and some black parents tried to register their children in white schools. The case of Mary Frances Ward became Dwinelle's test case, filed on Sept. 24, 1872 against Noah Flood, arguing that the 13th and 14 amendments were violated by exclusion from school based on race or color. SF Board of Education lawyers argued that separate schools were provided, and that was enough to fulfill requirements of the law, and that Mary Ward lacked the academic skills necessary for admission to Broadway school anyway. The Calif. supreme court justices agreed with SF, that Mary Ward was ill-prepared, but they went further, saying the separate but equal doctrine was permissable--22 years before the Plessy v. Ferguson case was similarly decided by the U.S. supreme court.

(23) Aug. 1875-SF's school board voted to end segregated schools-especially important since this was the largest city in the state and had the largest black population. In 1875 Oakland, Sacramento and Vallejo followed suit, and (25) in 1880, the state legislature passed a law that "schools must be open for the admission of all children" allowing exclusion only of those "children of filthy or vicious habots, or children suffering from contagious or infectious diseases." (26) This change was probably based on economic grounds, because of the high cost of operating the additional schools for nonwhite children. Further, most racial hate was directed at the Chinese, who were far more numerous than blacks. The 1880 statute was amended to allow segregation of Asian and Indian children. (27) Later segregation of blacks were of the de facto variety, due to residential patterns. By 1939, LA already had 9 predominently black schools.

CHINESE (28) By 1885 Sf had an estimated 722 school age children, mostly American citizens. The school board didn't want them in the public schools, claiming the children had too much contact with "the painted harolot of the slums and alleys, the women who are bought and sold to the slavery of prostitution" should the public schools "admit children reared in such an atmosphere?" (29) "we hope...we can justly and practically defend ourselves from this invasion of Mongolian barbarism."

This rhetoric erupted after Joseph and Mary Tape tried to enroll their 8 year old daughter Mamie in the Spring Valley school. Joseph

lived in SF 15 years, and Mamie was born there, they, unlike many Chinese, considered themselves americanized. Whey principal Jennie Hurley refused admission, the Tapes appealed to the Chinese Consulate in SF. He wrote city Supt. Moulder that this act violated treaties and laws, and appealed for the admission of Chinese children into public schools.

(31) The first Chinese public school opened in SF in Aug. 1859 at the corner of Stockton and Sacramento Sts., (32) but after James Denman, city supt. visited in Apr. 1860, and found only 3 students, he closed the school saying it was too expensive, that they had prejudices so strong that educating Chinese students was "'almost hopeless.'" [SF, 12th Annual Report, 1964:31-31]. A night school was formed in Oct. in a basement, that Tait said "deserved notice" but John Pelton, the next supt. called for a new school building for Chinese students, that this was (33) "a striking instrance of taxation without representation" [1867 school report: 55]. He didn't get the school, but was able to have Lanctot, the teacher, removed, after complaints about his Christian bias.

In 1869, Denman was reelected school supt., and again fought against the Chinese school, that since the school law required establishing schools for African and Indican children, and that no mention was made of Mongolian or Chinese children, that such schools need not be provided--despite the 1868 U.S. treaty with China that stipulated public education for Chinese children living in the U.S. So in Feb. 1871, the Chinese school was closed again.

The absence of public schools was compensated for in a limited sense by missionary schools supported by public donations through the Presbyterian Board of Missions. The first opened in 1853, and by 1871, several denominations held classes in english language for Chinese students. By 1876, (35) an estimated 5500 Chinese students attended mission schools, most only long enough to learn enough English to get jobs. Perhaps part of the reason for this was the orientation of the missions who would "bait out hook with the bait of the English primer and make the primer speak to them of Christ." (36) Chinese language schools were also founded by Chinese scholars, in 1862 smaller groups consolidated into the "six Companies" the "Chinese Benevolent Association" which provided education in traditional Chinese culture and values for a small fee.

But the Tapes were americanized, and these schools did not fill their needs. In 1877, 1300 Chinese petitioned the legislature calling for "establishment of separate schools for Chinese children and for universal education." The argued they had paid nearly $150,000 in taxes but got no schools. But anti-Chinese sentiment was growing throughout the country; in 1882 the first important immigration restriction was imposed--on the Chinese. (40) Moulder appealed for support against admitting Tape to an SF school, and State Supt. Welcher said the state constitution called the Chinese, "dangerous to the well-being of the state" and that he didn't see why SF should educate them. The SF board voted against Tape's admission. But since Mamie Tape was a citizen, she was entitled to equal protection, according to the state supreme court, and therefore another Chinese school was formed.

(43) The Tape decision had little impact outside SF except in Sacramento county, where in 1893, a segregated Chinese school was formed and in the early 1900's, three additional "Asiatic schools" were established for Chinese and Japanese. In 1929, three

Chinese/Japanese Sacramento county schools and the segregated SF Chinese schools were the only ones in the state. (44) By 1905, the SF allowed Chinese to attend public high schools after a threatened boycott of the primary schools, and in 1919 at lease one Chinese child attended a regular public school. Gradually the segregated Chinese schools were phased out in SF. (45) In 1945 a single all Chinese school remained, the Commodore Stockton, due to residential patterns. (46) In 1971 Chinese parents protested busing their children outside their district to achieve mixed schools.

JAPANESE-(48)Jan. 1907, Keikichi Aoki tried to enroll in a regular public school in SF, but was denied; (49) this began the most heated school segregation case prior to the 1950's. Only 148 Japanese lived in the U.S. in 1880, Japan had highly restrictive policies against emmigration that were not loosened until 1885. By 1890, Japanese amounted to 2000 in the U.S., in 1900 about 25,000 and 1910 over 70,000 with over 40,000 in Calif. The same hatred the Chinese received was applied to the Japanese. (52) But the Japan had a widespread public education system and the Japanese were among the best educated immigrant group to reach the U.S. (53) Although led by the Union Labor party, SF officials lined up against the Japanese, in practice Japanese attended regular public schools until after the 1906 quake.

(54) After the quake, Japanese, Korean and Chinese students ere forect to attend the former Chinese school, called the "Oriental Public School, on Clay between Powell and Mason. Most Japanese refuse, and waged their protest in part by appealing to the Japanese press in Japan pointing out the dishonor imposed on them. They were supported by some missionaries and the Japanese counsul protested to the U.S. government because this was a violation of the Treaty of 1894. (60) Pres. Roosevelt responded in a speech Dec. 4, 1906, condemning the SF situation, and swearing to enforce the terms of the treaty using "all the foces, military and civil, of the United States which I may lawfully employ." He called for a U.S. law permitting Japanese citizenship, and called their exclusion from schools a "wicked absurdity." (61) The speech angered many white Californians from Gov. Pardee on down. Only the LA Times commented favorably. A study of Japanese students in SF schools found they were only 93 out of 28,000 and attended only 23 or 72 schools in SF.

(62) Aoki v. Deane was prepared by the U.S. govt, and was filed in both federal district and state supreme courts. Attny. Robert Devlin argued that Japanese were not Mongolians, so couldn't be segregated (63) and that the state policy couldn't violate the federal treaty. However, it was not clear the U.S. could win, and Roosevelt hoped instead to negotiate a diplomatic solution, a "Gentleman's Agreement, (66) by getting a SF delegation to go along with a compromise where Japan would agree to deny further men the right to emigration to the U.S. SF mayor Schmitz, already under indictment, agreed. But the wives of Japanese in the U.S. continued to arrive, and antipathy worsened.

(69) A Japanese Exclusion League was organized in 1919 with support from labor, the American Legion, Sons and Daughters of the Golden West--their vocal speaker, Valentine S. McClatchy, of the Sac. and Fresno Bee newspapers. They helped promote restrictive immigration laws, and in 1924 the Congress prohibited further Japanese immigrants. This was not enough, though, since there were a growing number of Japanese Americans in the schools. McClatchy also worried

about the growing number of Japanese language schools, from about 80 in 1918 to 220 in 1935. However, these schools sought to make "good American citizens out of the children of Japanese parentage." People like McClatchy were still skeptical, and in 1923 state legislature outlawed the language schools, but it was vetoed by Gov. Richardson.

(72) In 1921 the legislature allowed the segregation of Japanese students, a route taken only by four small Sacramento districts: Courtland, Isleton, Walnut Grove and Florin, where Japanese were a majority of the local populations. (73) In 1929 575 Japanese went to these four schools, but statewide about 30,000 went to integrated schools, and were generally better students who tended to stay in school longer than the average for other groups.

(75) The war brought new problems to the Japanese, with their removal to relocation camps. Of the 100,000 who were concentrated, about 70,000 were Californians, and most were American-born. The War Relocation Agency became responsible for educating mover 25,000 students, and established a segregated camp school system to do so. By Sept. 1942, 8 of the 10 camps had schools in operation. (76) But resources were minimal, rooms were often unpartitioned, unheated, without supplies, books, desks, etc. Some Calif. school systems donated books, but other supplies and equipment were also inadequate, as were qualified teachers.

(77) Strangely enough, the camp officials tried to implement "progressive education" principles; schools were to become community centers, with PTAs, and parent advisory boards, and were supposed to inculcate "'an understanding of American ideals, institutions and practices;'" The schools had many student activities, student govt, athletic teams, drama, art and music programs, debating societies, etc. (78) All this in schools behind barbed wire.

(79) in 1944, camp inmates were allowed to leave to resettle in places other than the West Coast, and in Sept. 1945, they decided not to reopen the camp schools except at Tule Lake, despite parent protests. (81) Despite this segregation, "no immigrant group has used the public schools more effectively than the Japanese." They, to a greater extent than the Chinese, sought assimilation and education in the public school system.

INDIANS-(83) Calif's Indian population in 1769-between 200,000 and 300,000, by 1880 it was 20,000, Bancroft (HoC, v. 7:474-5) called this "one of the last human hunts in history, and the basest and most brutal of them all." Unlike the Spanish missions and Mexican ranchos, where quasi-educational training was provided to destroy tribal culture by Christianizing the Indians and making them into a "colonial workforce," the Anglo-Americans just wanted to get rid of them.

(84) Federal agents came in 1850 to negotiate treaties and remove Indians from areas white miners or settlers wanted; before 1853 18 treaties were signed the included 139 Indian communities with about 25,000 people; removal from the gold region in the Sierra foothills to 7.5 million acres of the Central Valley; Washington promised in return to provide economic aid, social services and education:
in all, 22 principal teachers, 45 assts and 54 schools, but the Senate refused to ratify the treaties (85) and only 5 small reservations were created; by the mid1860s, only two remained: Hoopa Valley, Humboldt Cty. and Tule River, San Joaquin Valley; however, the U.S. govt, through the Bureau of Indian Affairs had primary control over Indian ed.

The state passed laws permitting the indenture of Indian children

and private employers to take vagrant Indians as unpaid laborers; like blacks and asians, they couldn't vote, testify in court against whites, or hold political office; in the 1860s, they were banned from white public schools; as result of Ward v. Flood in 1874, they could go to white schools if the district had no colored school; but few Indians wanted this type of schooling anyway, and in 1865-66, only 63 were enrolled in public schools.

RESERVATION SCHOOLS were planned by the BIA at Tule and Hoopa but (86) George Hoffman, Tule Indian agent argued against it because it would be a waste of money for Indians who were "cruel, cowardly vagabond, given to thieving. gambling, drunkeness and all that is vicious without one redeeming trait" that anyway the Indians "must soon be extinct." But by 1872, schools were established in both camps, a total of 127 students; in the 1880s, more money was apportioned by Congress for the "Mission Indians" of this state, and the number of schools gradually increased; by 1891 the BIA had 2 boarding shcools and 12 reservation schools operating; by 1900 6 boarding schools and 20 reservation schools with 900 students in all; (87) but the culture-destroying aspect of education discouraged Indian parents from sending their children. Evelyn Adams study found these schools sought "to destroy the tribal ways and train the individual Indian to earn his living like a white man." The Hoopa Indian agent thought students should "be kept strictly removed from all tribal or family associations, for withou enforcement of such removal but little permanent mental or moral improvement need be anticipated (1885 Annual Comm. of Indian Affairs report, 5-6).

PUBLIC SCHOOLS-by 1892, the BIA began contracting with Calif. school districts to enroll reservation children in public schools by paying tuition expenses; initially this included 51 students in 3 school districts in Shasta, San Diego and Inyo counties; (88) Since 1880, Indians were allowed to attend regular schools, but in 1893, the legislature changed the law to permit segregated Indian schools again. But some white groups reacted to this treatment; in 1907 the Northern Calif. Indian Assn. argued Indians should be allowed public education on the same footing as whites; Indians met with another group of sympathetic whites at Mt. Herman, Santa Cruz county in 1907 demanding "'common school education for our children'" (N.Calif. Indian Assn, Zayante Indians Conference, Mt. Herman, 1907:6-7). (89) The BIA and local commissioners saw integration into public schools as consistent with their policies of assimilation, agreed to pay all tuition charges, and actively worked to bring this about until 1917 when the U.S. Comptroller of the Treasury said few Calif. Indians were eligible for these payments [it seems because they didn't actually live on reservation land?]. (continued next record)

26. Wollenberg, Charles M., All Deliberate Speed: Segregation and Exclusion in California Schools (2/3 continued), Berkeley: University of California Press, 1976

Subjects: segregation, integration, court cases

Notes: (89) According to the BIA, in 1918 for the first time, more Indian students attended public than BIA schools, 1820 to 1745 repectively. (90) But many whites so strongly opposed Indian

integration, they took their kids out of school if Indians admitted (as in Colusa Cty., Sac. Valley); New segregated Indian schools were built largely with federal funds. In 1915, Agent L.A. Dorrington asked BIA support building of two additional county public schools for Indians (National Archives, SF Branch, Record Group 75, Files of L.A. Dorrington, Box 15, Oct 19, 1915). By 1920, however, the BIA subsidy program to local districts was doing better; a request for was submitted by local supts. for subsidies.

(91) The BIA also go support from state officials; Supt. Will C. Wood and Supervisor of Attendance Georgiana Carden who brought pressure on local districts to admit Indian students; the BIA also promised to provide for about 200 additional students in boarding school whose backgrounds made them "'unacceptable'" for public school. But in 1921, the legislature passed a law prohibiting Indian attendance in districts where a BIA school was avaiable within 3 miles; Alice Piper was the test case of this law

(92) Interested citizens and groups continued their support for integration. Among the most active was SF's Indian Board of Cooperation; its secretary Rev. Frederick G. Collett, he and his wife taught in a Colusa County Indian school; they encouraged other schools to apply for the BIA Indian subsidies, but this didn't win them the admiration of the BIA, who investigated their activities, but later cleared them of charges; In 1917, the IBoC represented a Lake Cty. Indian Ethen Anderson, who sought to become a registered voter. Federal law didn't allow Indians living in tribes to become citizens; (93) but most Calif. Indians didn't have tribal status, and so Anderson's victory "effectively established suffrage for the bulk of Calif. Indians." The IBoC concentrated primarily on schools, though. In 1923, it represented Virginia Knight, a Mendocino cty. Indian, winning the right for her to enroll in Carrol District public school; in Lake County, it helped the Women's Clubs get a segregated public school for Indians at Big Valley reservation.

(94) Indians in the Big Pine area had a local BIA school, but didn't like rules that required manual labor by the students on school grounds, and offered schooling only up to grade five; they sought integration of Big Pine Schools; after tried unsuccessfully to get the school board to admit Indian students, but they wouldn't, and more attacks on Collett were launched to discredit him; but this didn't eliminate the issue of integration (96) and when Alice Piper was denied entrance to the Big Pine School, J.W. Henderson, pres. of the IBoC, took the matter before the Calif. supreme court; the court ruled that like Anderson, Piper didn't belong to an organized tribal group, so had the right to attend the public school, and further, that under the Dawes Act of 1887, Piper qualified as a U.S. and a Calif. citizen, so couldn't be denied schooling on the "basis of race or color difference." (Piper v. Big Pine School District, 193 Calif. Reports (1925); (98) in 1924 Congress granted citizenship to all Indians; in 1928 Calif. appellate court permitted enrollment of Wesley Peters, a member of a tribal group who lived on Indian land to attend a public school in Parma District, San Diego cty. However, the ruling in the Piper case did not eliminate the separate but equal doctrine, nor did large numbers of Indians enroll in public schools: in 1931 2800 were enrolled in Calif. public schools and there were 7 segregated Indian schools with a total of 92 students; in 1935 the legislature outlawed segregation of Indians born in the U.S. ending legal segregation for this group--though not ending their vindictive

treatment at the hands of many whites.

(99) In 1926, about a third of Calif. Indians still attended BIA schools; Fort Bidwell's reservation boarding school was called "'a Disgrace'" and those in Hoopa Valley and Fort Yuma were about the same; the Sherman Institute in Riverside was the best boarding school, but it operated on "'the conception that the Indian is inferior to the whiteman...Every Indian girl is viewed as a potential house servant and every boy as a farm hand." (100) Tule River was thought to have the best day school.

(101) Johnson-O'Mally Act (JOM) permitted the BIA contract with the states to provide education for the Indians; in 1935, Calif. was the first state to sign such an agreement, and the BIA schools were phased out; in the 1950s only the Sherman Institute remained in operation and its students came from outside Calif. Mary Steward, of the BIA, was given a place in the Dept. of Ed. to ensure the federal funds benefitted Indians, but felt her efforts made little difference; she resigned in 1941 and was not replaced; (102) in 1953, JOM funds were reduced saying that states shouldn't be entitled to special funds for educating Indians; but some of these funds were replaced with "impacted area" monies and federal aid to poverty stricken areas.

Overall, educational programs for Indians in Calif. were a failure; in 1960, they had the highest unemployment rate and lowest income level of any ethnic group in the state (103); drop out rates were esp. high; educators blamed the Indians for their "'complacent attitude...toward school and life in general.'" Others thought that the absence of Indian teachers had a lot to do with the problem, that this fostered the idea "that the white man intends to turn their children into white men."

(106) Indians themselves became more actively involved in promoting educational activities in the late 1960s. They organied the Calif. Indian Education Assn. and succeeded in getting additional JOM fund for the state for projects in which Indians had some control; the SF Amercian Indian Historical Society worked to change stereotypes in textbooks and school lessons.

MEXICAN-AMERICANS (109) The first great migration from Mexico to Calif. didn't occur until about 1900, many recruited for work on railroads being built then in the southwest; another influx came about 1910, refugees fleeing the revolution; labor shortages after World War 1 combined with restrictions on asian immigration, led to additional movement of Mexican into this area during the 1920s for railroad and agricultural work; by the mid 1920s, they formed most of the labor force in the Imperial and San Joaquin valleys, and in the citrus belt around LA; according to the US census, Mexican and Mexican-Am. population in Calif. tripled from about 121000 to 368000 during the 1920s, and this is probably understated--so by 1930, they formed the largest "minority" group in the state, and still are; (111) by 1927, they formed about 10 per cent of public school enrollment, about 65,500 students; and they were heavily concentrated in the south; over half in LA county; in Orange county, they formed neary 20 per cent of public school enrollment, and Imperial county, accounted for 36 per cent of enrollment.

Segregated schools were built in many areas: in Padadena in 1913; in Ontario in 1921, and a second in 1928 due to heavy enrollments; by 1910 in Riverside, an elementary was predominantly Mexican, and one built in 1924 at the request of whites; In Dan Joaquin Valley, Mexicans couldn't go to a new school built in 1920; Santa Ana was

broken into districts such that 3 Mexican school zones emerged and whites in these zones could transfer to other schools; in LA, zones were also drawn to create segregated schools.

(113) Many educators considered segregation a sound educational practice too; Grace Stanley believed Mexican children weren't suited for "book study and seat work" and were happier with their own kind. (114) During the 1920s, they began developing "Americanization" programs to promote assimilation; schools prohibited use of Spanish, stressed Am. values, sanitation and work habits; they argued such programs would be best carried out in segregated schools or classes, so that white students wouldn't be held back; In 1921, the legislature required migrant families to send their children to school and had the Dept. of Ed. develop programs for migrants. After examining a Ventura cty. pilot project, Georgiana Carden decided that it would be better if these children were accepted into regular schools. (115) Segregationists were given additional support by the promoters of IQ testing which seemed to suggest that Mexicans had lower potential for learning--though higher than that of Indians, Slavish, Italians, and Negroes.

(124) In once protest by parents in Lemon Grove in 1931, a local court ruled that 75 Mexican children could attend a white school, as a local case, it didn't set any precedent in the state. (118) "Ironically, although Mexicans were by far the most segregated group in Calif. public education by the end of the 1920s they were never specifically mentioned in the Education Code" which allowed segregation of Chinese, Japanese, "Mongolians" and Indians until 1935, when some Indians born in the U.S. were exempted.

(121) In 1945 Helen Heffernan, then chief of elementary ed, in the Dept. of Ed., and Coreen Seeds, prin. of the University oElementary School at UCLA, wrote that segregation had "backfired" and must be eliminated; after the war, racial hatred was identified with nazism, and equality and the absence of prejudice were supposed to be characteristics of the allies. In 1945, Mexican parents became more actively involved in protesting segregation, forcing school boards to consider integration in Ontario, Mendota, Riverside and San Bernardino; Gonzalo Mendez and William Guzman and three others sued Westminster, Garden Grove, El Modeno and Santa Ana all in Orange cty, represented by David Marcus, who (126) argued the 5th and 14th amendments of his clients were violated, along with those of 5000 other students in the 4 districts. Joel Ogle, for the schools, said the U.S. courts had no jurisdiction in ed. matters, and that Plessy v. Ferguson allowed segregation for providing special instruction as was the case in Orange cty. schools; (127); Judge McCormick disagreed, Calif. ed. code didn't name Mexicans for segregation, so to do so was arbitrary, and in violation of due process; and that Plessy only applied where state code imposed segregation, so didn't apply here; (128) he brought in supporting social theory to advocate assimilation through integration; (129) Ogle appealed but lost in federal district court; but the separate but equal doctrine remained in force; (132) in June 1947 Gov. Earl Warren signed a bill that struck down school segregation laws still on the books, eliminating the legal separate but equal doctrine in the state.

(134) De jure segregation, however, became more widespread; in 1966, a Dept. of Ed. survey found 57 per cent of Spanish surname students attended segregated schools; in 1973, John Caughey estimated the number to be about 66 per cent in LA; overall, segregation for

Mexican-Am. students was probably greater in 1973 than in 1947 when Mendiz was decided. (137) Pasadena is his primary case study for the aftermath of Brown-the city had a history of de jure segregation; had established "neutral attendance zones" where whites could transfer out of predominantly black districts but blacks couldn't; in Jackson v. Pasadena, Jay Jackson protested not being able to transfer out of a predom. segregated, and therefore "therefore inferior" school; (142) the Calif. supreme court ruled Pasedena had violated Brown, "in effect...found guilty of purposeful, de jure segregation"; beyond that, the court ruled that "'residential segregation is itself an evil'" and steps must be taken to correct the inbalance; that schools must reduce both de facto and de jure segregation;

(143) the Dept. of Ed. was already moving in this direction, and a statewide racial school census began in fall 1966 which revealed more segregation than anyone expected; overall of Calif. school children: 13 % Spanish surname; 8% black; 2% Asian; almost 1% Indian and other; further, 12% of black; 28% Spanish; and 39% of which children went to racially balanced schools; 85% black, 57% Spanish and 6% white attended predominantly minority schools; (144) racial balance guideline of +/- 15% of the ethnic composition of the school district was adopted, and districts not within this range were to take steps to improve. Some cities, notably Riverside and Berkeley, had already taken steps in that direction.

With passage of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, and reports like "Equality of Educational Opportunity" by James Coleman and others (1966) and "Racial Isolation in the Public Schools" by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights (1967) some attitudes were changing, and the effects of segregation were seen as negative even in the cautious Coleman report. (148) A backlash was not long in coming, however, in the wake of riots over racial tensions and the Viet Nam war. (149) And in Richmond, integration efforts failed; school board members supporting busing were voted out; a conservative, anti-busing board took over and promoted an "open enrollment" program, so in 1972, racial balance still eluded some Richmond schools and the board contined to resist stronger efforts at integration.

Similarly, in Pasadena, problems were increasing, the school board refused to take action to reduce segregation after the Jackson decision; some black neighborhoods were declared open enrollment zones, and parents allowed to apply for a limited number of openings in predominently white schools; (150) but open enrollment as a strategy for achieving racially balanced schools was not effective; Pasedena was warned by the Dept. of Ed. to adopt a better approach ("Plan A"), but in 1967 candidates opposed to the approach were elected, and open enrollment was reinstated. In Spangler v. Pasadena, 3 John Muir students (2 white, 1 black) asked a LA superior court judge to order Pasadena to implement Plan A; (151) the judge wouldn't act; in Oct. 1968, the case was refiled in LA federal district court, on the basis of violation of the 14th Amendment and the Civil Rights Act of 1964 by maintaining a segregated school; in Nov. the US Justice Dept. entered the case, broadening it to include all the schools in the district, not just high schools; documents were submitted showing school board decisions on "boundaries, transfers, construction plans and transportation programs that created or reinforced segregated school patterns." (152) Testimony was given showing discrimination against black applicants for teaching positions, a school supt. told

by the board to "'keep [his] mouth shut' [about desegregation]." (152) Judge Manuel Real didn't think "'all deliberate speed'" was fast enough in Pasadena's case; he ordered the board to submit a plan to be acted upon by Sept. 1970; no school was to have a majority of minority students.

The board decided to go along with the court order and not appeal, (155) but the 3 members who had voted against the appeal were subjected to a recall election in Oct. 1970, all but one of the candidates who filed to run for the three places opposed integration; however, the recall election failed by a narrow margin the (156) result of the unusually high turnout among black voters, whites predominently suppported the recall.

Crawford v. LA (157)- In Feb. 1970, LA Unified School District was found guilty of unconstitutional segregation; it was the 2nd largest district in the US, with over 700,000 students; about 25% black and 23% Mexican descent; about 90% of the blacks went to 117 predom. black schools and 66% of the Mexican-Am. to 100 predom. Mexican schools; 80% of the whites went to schools with less than one black student per class; agitation for deseg. began in 1962, but little changed before the 1965 Watts riots, (158) by 1968, seg. was probably worse than in '62, so the ACLU revived the Crawford case, and in 1970, Judge Gitelson ordered that no school should have a majority of minority students. The decision created a strong backlash: Max Rafferty went on the record against forced busing; Gov. Reagan argued it would "shatter the concept of the neighborhood school as the cornerstone of our educational system"; Mayor Sam Yorty thought it would split the country; (159) Pres. Nixon thought it was the most extreme decision made so far; LA officials claimed it would cost $40 million the first year and $20 million a year thereafter to bus 240,000 students, figures rejected by the ACLU and the judge; the decision was appealed and meanwhile little improvement was made in LA schools and Judge Gitelson lost in the Nov. election;

Johnson v. San Francisco (160) SF had the greatest mix in population: only about one third white; 29% black; 18%Asian; 12% Latino; 7+% Indian and other; Sept. 1971, district wide desegregation was ordered by Sept.'71; Chinese were among the most opposed to busing and asked to be exempt from the order; this was refused, and they formed "freedom schools" (162) in protest; when busing began, over 40% of the students stayed home the first day; gradually they went to school except in Chinatown and on Treasure Island Naval Base;

(163) Wilson Riles said reactions were exaggerated, that "It becomes easy for political people to ride the tide of emotion." So, in 1970, the State Board of Ed. rescinded the 15% guideline and in the Assembly, Floyd Wakefield introduced a bill prohibiting the busing of students without parental permission; a Sacramento court overruled the St. Board's action and the effect of Wakefield was limited to cases other than for busing to improve racial inbalance; Wakefield in 1972 sought a constitutional amendment voiding integration guidelines, approved by voters two to one but declared unconstitutional by the state supreme court.

(165-7) Busing came under attack by academics too, including Chris Jencks and David Armour; Arthur Jensen revived the IQ debates claiming heredity over environment; even radicals on the left saw busing as futile; (168) Whites weren't leaving cities because of busing, but they were taking their kids out of public schools; in 1973, anti-busing candidates replace the integrationist members of the

school board; (172) in 1974, they asked Judge Real to set aside his order, so they could attract whites back to the schools; he refused; In April, '74, the HEW said it was cutting off nearly $2 million in aid to Pasadena because the city schools were in violation of Judge Real's order; Real blamed the attitudes of the school board itself for the failure in Pasadena; controversy continued and in Oct. '74, a recall was announced for the anti-busing majority on the board which appeared to have broad public support by that time; but the recall failed; the busing cases would be appealed.

(179) On appeal, the distinction between de jure and de facto segregation would be crucial; while opposing legal exclusion on principle, exclusion due to local custom seemed to be all right; (180) neighborhood schools has been a euphemism in the cause of antibusing forces, in 1972 900000 Calif. students rode buses, but only 50,000 in the effort to integrate schools; (continued next record).

27. Wollenberg, Charles M., All Deliberate Speed: Segregation and Exclusion in California Schools (3/3), Berkeley: University of California Press, 1976.

Subjects: segregation, integration, school law

Notes: (continued from previous record) (181) While anti-integrationists have siezed on busing and the neighborhood school concept as their banners, supporters of integration have not been very clear on their goals either; they say integrated school will lead to a variety of improvements in learning, but these connections haven't been demonstrable; too, they seem to be arguing for assimilation, which has become an unfashionable goal even among conservatives; by defining minority children as "culturally disadvantaged" they seem to be saying that the children have the wrong values and need to adopt the superior values of the majority; Wollenberg suggests that while segregation has been rooted in racial prejudice, class prejudice may underlie integrationist as well as segregationist attitudes; there has always been room for those minorities who won't "disrupt the middle class values and assumptions on which the schools operated."

(182) "Euphemisms like "culturally disadvantaged," though unclear in some ways, may be evidence that racial prejudice to some extent is declining; the election of Wilson Riles and Tom Bradley, by predominently white electorates, support this idea; also, in Calif. the anti-busing forces used the relatively patient legal means of the court system and ballot box to win; they didn't riot, attack buses carrying black children to make their point, as happened elsewhere. But most white parents don't want their children bused to poor black neighborhoods to achieve racial balance; (183) "racial stereotypes and institutional practices are still with us. To some degree, all Californians, white and non-white, are both bearers and victims of these invisible chains."

Coleman still believes busing attempts led to white flight, but this flight has been going on for longer than that, the suburbs had other attractions and schools had other problems than only the integration issue; (184) and it seems unclear that the school can change public sentiments about race and segregation; Jencks and others argue that schools can do little to improve economic inequality

either; while Ivan Illich blames schools for many of today's social problems;

And the schools can't address many problems like declining living standards in the inner city where minorities are often concentrated; (185) federal housing policies have aided residential patterns that increase segregation, that need not have been the case; strangely enough, supporters of integration have largely ignored what happened inside the classroom; if reduced racism is sought, it could be taught in school, Charles Glock and others have found it is not; bland generalizations that racism is bad do not make an impression on students; at any rate, "regimentation and conformity" are among the important values conveyed in schools, not "freedom and equality." Glock thinks such ideas can be incorporated in school curricula, but Wollenberg doesn't have much hope of this (186) until leaders and institutions in this country make a conscious commitment to breaking out of the racist past; school and courts can't achieve this alone; the "ultimate question" according to Wollenberg, is "whether the educational and judicial systems are to be part of any concerted and consistent national effort to end racism in America. There is no assurance that such an effort will succeed, but it certainly is worth a try."

Cases cited: Ethen Anderson v. Matthews (1917); Keikichi Aoki v. M.A. Deane, Petition for Writ of Mandate, Supreme Court of the State of California, San Francisco (1907): 1-13; Mary Crawford v. Los Angeles (1970); Jay R. Jackson v. Pasadena City School District 59 California Reports 876-92 (1963); Johnson v. San Francisco Unified School District 339 Federal Supplement 1315 (1971) Virginia Knight (1923); Lau v. Nichols 93 Supreme Court Reporter 2786 (1972-1973); Lemon Grove (1931); Gonzalo Mendez et al. v. Westminster School District of Orange County et al., 64 Federal Supplement 551 (1946); Wesley Peters (1948) [Parma District, San Diego County]; Alice Piper v. Big Pine School District (1924); Nancy Anne Spangler et.al. v. Pasadena City Board of Education et al., 311 Federal Supplement 501-24 (1970); Mamie Tape v. Hurley (1884-1885); Mary Francis Ward v. Flood (1874); Wong Him v. Callahan (1902); Wysinger v. Crookshank, 82 California 593 (1890).